

THE  
BAPTIZING  
OF  
INFANTS

REVIEWED and DEFENDED  
from the Exceptions

OF  
Mr. T O M B E S,  
In his three last CHAPTERS of his  
*Book* Intituled  
ANTIPEDOBAPTISME.

---

By *H.<sup>on<sup>ly</sup></sup> Hammond*, D. D.

---

LONDON,  
Printed by *J. Fleisher*, for *Richard Royston* at the  
*Angel* in *177 lane*, and for *Richard Davis* Bookseller  
in *Oxford*. 1655.






---

# THE BAPTIZING OF INFANTS

Reviewed and Defended.

---

## The Introduction.

1. AVING, by Gods help, past through many *stadia* in these *agones*, and therein paid some degree of obedience to the precept of *Christ*, *Mat. 5. 41.* and withall to *S. Peters* directions of rendering an account of the Faith which is in us, *πυνθίζετε* even to him that most *unnecessarily* requires it; There is yet remaining one matter of discourse, wherein some seeming *ingagement* lyes upon me, occasioned by the *Resolution* of the 4<sup>th</sup> *Quære*, concerning *Infant Baptisme*; For to this *Mr. Jo: Tombes* hath offered some *answers* in the *three last Chapters* of his *Book* intituled *Antipadobaptism*.

2. What I have thought meet to return to these, might, I supposed, have been not unfitly *annexed* by way of *appendage* to that of *Festivals*; the treatises of *Festivals* and *Infant Baptisme* being so neerly conjoynd in the first draught or *monogramme*, that the defence of them (which may in some degree passe for the *ῥωσάφισις*) ought in congruity to be contrived into the *same* table also. But the length of this *Answer* hath dissuaded that, and the desire that the *Reader* may have no taskes *imposed* on him but by his own *choice*, hath advised the *publishing* this by it self, with some hope that this may conclude his *trouble*, and that this *new* year may not bring me so many occasions of such *contest*, as the last hath done.

## CHAP. I.

## Of Baptisme among the Jewes.

## SECT. I.

*Probations more and less perfect. The use of Circumcision to this question of Padobaptisme. As also of Christ's reception of children. Childrens coming and believing, Mat. 18. Children sinners.*

1. **T**He foundation of Mr. Tombes's returns to me he is pleased to lay in some words, which he hath recited out of §. 23. of my Resolution of the 4<sup>th</sup> Quære, where I say, that there is no need of laying much weight on this, or any the like more imperfect wayes of probation, the whole fabrick being sufficiently supported and built on this basis (the customary baptismes among the Jewes) and that discernible to be so, if we consider it first negatively, then positively.
2. To this he begins his Reply with these words, I like the Doctors ingenuity in his waving the imperfect wayes of proving Infant Baptisme, viz. the example of circumcision, Gen. 17. of baptizing a whole household, Act. 16. 33. Christs reception of little children, Mat. 19. 14. Mar. 10. 16. and doubt not to shew his own to be no better then those he relinquisheth.
3. To this introduction of his I shall make some Reply in a generall reflexion on the Treatise which he undertakes to answer, and begin with disclaiming his good words and approbation of my ingenuity, assuring him that he is wholly mistaken in these his first lines and that I do in no wise relinquish those wayes of probation by him taken notice of, nor shall so far despise the authority and aides of the ancient Church writers, who have made use of them, as wholly to neglect the force and virtue of them. And I thought it had been to him visible, that I have made my advantage of every one of them §. 20. 21, 22. though I do verily think the foundation of this practice is more fully laid in that other of Jewish Baptisme,

*Baptisme*, which belonged to all, both *Jews*, and *proselytes children*, *females* as well as *males*, whereas *circumcision* belonging to *males* onely, was in that and some other respects a *less perfect* basis of it.

4. Meanwhile, for the clearing of this whole matter, it must be remembred that *probations* are of *two* sorts, either *less* or *more perfect*, those I call *less perfect*, which though they have full force in them, as far as they are used, yet are not of so large an extent as to conclude the *whole* matter in debate, which others that are *more perfect* may be able to do.
5. I shall apply this to the matter before us. The *insituting* of the *Sacrament* of *circumcision* among the *Jewes*, and the expreſs command of *God* that the children of *eight daies old* should by this rite be received into *Covenant*, is an irrefragable evidence that those may be capable of receiving a *Sacrament*, who have not attained to *years* of *understanding* the nature of it, that children may be received into *Covenant* with *God* though they are not personally able to *undertake* or performe the condition of it, and then that argument will so far be applicable to *Padobaptisme*, as to evidence the *lawfulness* and *fitness* of it among *Christians*, by this analogie with *God's institution* among the *Jewes*, and so certainly invalidate all the arguments of the *Antipadobaptist* (i. e. of *Mr. Tombes*) drawn from the incapacity of *Infants*, from the pretended necessity that *preaching* should go before *baptizing*, from the qualifications required of those that are *baptized*, &c. For all these objections lying and being equally in force against *circumcising* of *Infants*, it is yet evident to be the appointment of *God* that every *Infant* of *8. daies old* should be *circumcised*, *Gen. 17. 12.* and the threatening of *God* denounced against them as transgressors in case it be neglected, *The uncircumcised manchild shall be cut off from his people, he hath broken my covenant, v. 14.* And this the rather, because the *Apostle* compares *baptisme* of *Christians* with *circumcision*, *Col. 2. 11. 12.* In whom ye are circumcised — buried with *Christ* in *baptisme*, *Isidor Pelusiote*, l. 1. Ep. 125. ἀντὶ βαπτισματὸς τῆς μετονομασίης Ἰουδαῖοι ἐπέχοντο, the *Jews* used *circumcision* in stead of *baptisme*, whereupon *S. Epiphanius* styles *Baptisme* μεγάλην μετονομασίην the great *circumcision*, and *S. Augustine* to them that require a *divine authority*, where by

\* De Bapt.  
centr: Donat:  
l. 4. c. 23.

- to prove the *baptisme of Infants*, renders this of the \* *Jewish circumcision*, *ex qua veraciter coniciatur quid valeret in parvulus Sacramentum Baptismi*, whereby true judgement may be made what force the *Sacrament of Baptisme* may have in *Infants*. And in like manner *Isidore l. 1. Ep. 125.* where upon consideration of the *Angel* coming, to kill *Moses* becaule of the *childs* not being *circumcised*, he concludes, *οὐδ' αὖτος τὰ νῦν δὲ βαπτίζωμεν*, *Let us make haste to baptize our children.*
6. Yet because what is thus evidenced to be lawfull, and agreeable to divine appointment in the old Testament, is not thereby presently proved necessary under the New (*Christ* might otherwise have ordained, if he had pleased, and from his ordinance onely, as that was understood by his *Apostles* and by them delivered to the Church, the necessity of our obedience, and so of *Baptizing Infants*, is completely deduced) therefore it is, that I mentioned this, as a more imperfect way of probation, in respect of the intire conclusion, which I undertook to make, viz. not onely the lawfulness, but the duty and obligation, that lies upon us to bring our *Infants* to *Baptisme*; which by the way, was much more then was necessary (the shewing the lawfulness being sufficient, and the example of *circumcision* being competent) for the disproving the pretensions of the *Antipadebaptist*, and so, ex abundanti, an act of *Supererogatory* probation, in relation to *Mr. T.*
7. The same is applicable in some degree to the other waies of probation, which he supposeth to be relinquish'd by me, especially to that of *Christ's* behaviour to little children, commanding to suffer them to come unto him (who yet were no otherwise able to come then as they were brought, and as now they come to the font for *baptisme*) and embracing and laying on his hands and blessing them: But this is competently set down, and the force of it, how far tis argumentative, § 22.
8. Onely I now adde, that that other place of *Mat. 18. 6.* where *Jesus* speaking of little children, useth these words, *who so offendeth one of these little ones that believe in me, it were good for him that a Millstone &c.* may tend much to give us the full importance and signification both of their coming to *Christ*, and of his commanding not to forbid them (such as will neatly concern every

every *Antipædobaptist* to take notice of) For as in other places of the *New Testament*, the coming unto God and Christ, is believing on him, seeking to receive benefit from him (as, *He that cometh to me shall never hunger, and Come unto me all ye that are weary, and If any man thirst let him come unto me and drink*.) so, it seems, by this place, that that coming of the *Belien little Infants* (for so they are called in the *Parallel place Luk. 9. 47.*) which they were capable of by the help of their parents or friends, is styled by Christ the childrens believing, and so far imputed to them, as that upon that account the sentence is very severe upon those that shall scandalize them, repulse or discourage, or any way hinder them in this their progress to Christ, though it be but in the armes of other men.

9. How fitly this is applicable to the state of *Infants*, in respect of the guilt of *original sin*, under which they are born, and for the remission of which (and not onely for the entring into the *Kingdome of Heaven*) the *Fathers* defined against the *Pelagians*, that *baptisme* was necessary for them, I shall not need here to enlarge, having formerly spoken to that head. Onely it may not be amiss here to advert, that it was as reasonable for the children to be called *mevovtes believers*, who yet had no faith of their own, but onely of their parents &c. to bring them to Christ, as for the same children to be accounted sinners (as undoubtedly they are) which yet never committed any act of sin, which made *S. Augustine De verb. Apost. Sermon 14.* say, *Absit ut ego dicam non credentes infantes*, God forbid that I should say that *Infants* are not believers, *Credit in altero, qui peccavit in altero*, He believes by another who sinned by another, *dicitur, Credit, & valet, & inter fideles baptizatos computatur*, the *Susceptors* say he believes, and so he is reputed among the baptized believers. And this *reputative faith* the more reasonably accepted by the Church, it being moreover evident by the baptism of *Simon Magus*, and of all hypocrites, that 'tis the profession of faith, and not the possession of it, which is required as the qualification which authorizes the Church to admit them to baptism; and that being performed by the *Infants proxies* in his name, the Church after the forementioned example of Christ, may very lawfully accept it of those, who can performe no other, in lieu of a personal profession.

Mean-

10. Meanwhile this passage of *Christ* concerning *children*, though it be a certain *evidence* again against the *Ancipadobaptist*, as hath been shewed, and I need no more then this one proof, if I were destitute of all others, to refute his *pretensions*; yet because it contains no relation of *Christs*, or his *Apostles baptizing infants*, therefore I put it in the rank of the *more imperfect probations* (in comparison with that other way of *probation*, which I conceive, *deduceth* and *concludeth* the *whole* matter more *intirely*) though, as tis evident §. 22. this was neither *waved* nor *relinquish* by me.
11. To this if I shall now adde, that it was my design in that *resolution* of the *Quere* to insist more largely on that way of *probation*, which I discerned to be lesse *considered* or insisted on by *others*, and yet to have *perfect evidence* in it, if it were duely explained and improved as it was *capable*, and on the same account thought I might spare to *multiply* words, where others had often *enlarged*, and therefore said but little of those *common arguments* or heads of *probation*, and yet sufficient to *testifie* my neither *waving* nor *relinquishing* them, It will then abundantly appear, how little I deserved Mr. T. his *good words*, and how justly I renounce that title to *ingenuity* which he bestowes upon me, being better pleased with his animadversions on my *dotages*, as he after phraseth it, then these his *Adversaries* his *liberalities* to me by which he designed *advantage* to himself.

---

### Sect. 2.

*The necessity of Padobaptisme depending on the positive part of the probation. The severall sorts of Anabaptists. Testimonies the onely proof of Institutions.*

1. **B**Efore I proceed I must desire the Reader to consider *two* things,  
 1. That the *Jewish baptism* is not by me set up as the competent proof, but onely as the ground or *foundation* (which taken by its self is always very *imperfect* in respect of the whole *fabrick* or *building*), 2. That the *perfect proof* being set down to consist  
 of

of two parts, a *negative* and a *positive*, the first onely shewing the *no incongruity* or *unlawfulness* of baptizing Infants, and the second adding thereto *duty* and *obligation*, these two must in all reason remain *conjoynd* in our *discourse*, and not be sever'd, or considered asunder, as if I thought the *former* way of *negative* probation sufficient to do the whole work without the assistance of the *latter*; This I need not have said in relation to *Mr. T.* For the bare *negative* consideration (that there is *nothing* in the *pattern* whence *Christs* baptisme is copied out, *nothing* in the *copie* it self, as far as *Christs* words in the *Gospel*, or the *Apostles* practice extend, &c.) is perfectly sufficient to refute an *antipedo-baptist* (such as he professeth to be) who undertakes to shew the baptizing of Infants to be *unlawfull*, but cannot pretend to shew it by any other way, but by producing some either *law* or *practice* of *Christ* or his *Apostles* to the contrary, which he must be concluded unable to do, if my *Negative* stand inviolate; But I thus interpose (and do it thus early) because the *positive* part, being indeed the *principal*, especially when it is also added to the *negative*, doth not onely demonstrate it *lawfull*, but *duty*, to offer and receive our Infants to baptisme, the judgement and practice of the *Universal Church* for 1600 years. (received, as the *Fathers* with one consent testifie, from the *Apostles*, as the will of *Christ* himself) having this force and *authority* over every meek son of the *Church*, that he may not without incurring *God's* displeasure, *oppugne* or *contemne* it.

3. And so by this means there is much more performed then was *needful*, if *Mr. T.* had been the onely *adversary* foreseen, even that which may convince all sorts of *opposers* and *disputers* in this matter, from \* *Peter de Bruce* and *Henry* his Scholar, and the \* *Petrobussiani* and *Henriciani* that sprang from them, to *Nicholas* in *Pras. ad* *Storck* and *Johs Munzer*, *Melchior Rinck*, *Balibazar H. b.* *maier*, *Michael Satelar* the *Switzers*, and so on to *Michael* *Hofman* the *skin*ner in the *Low Countries*, to *Uibo* and *Meno* of *Friseland*, and *Theodorick Ubb's* son, and all their fol- *See G. Cassan. Duc. Jul. Cliv. ex Nichol. Eludick de O. g. Scd. Anabapt.*  
lowers, which either then lived, and set up in *Germany*, or are now revived, or copied out among us; This one deduction of this practice (of baptizing Infants) from the *Apostles*, if it be solid, being abundantly sufficient to make an end of all *controversies* of



this kind. It being highly *unreasonable* that an *institution* of *Christ's*, such as each *Sacrament* is, should be judged of by any other *rule* (whether the *phantasies* or *reasons* of men) but either the words wherein the *institution* is set down, or (when they, as they are recorded in the *Scripture*, come not home to the *deciding* of the *controversie*) by the *records* of the *practice*, whether of *Christ*, or (because he *baptized* not himself) of the *Apostles*, however *conserved* or made *known* unto us.

4. In a word then, the *customary baptism* among the *Jews* being first laid onely as the *basis* and *foundation* (which, as I said, must be observed to differ from the *whole building*, being indeed onely, the first and most *imperfect* part of it) and evidently brought home and applied to every branch of the *Christian baptism*, I desire Mr. T. will permit the *baptism* of our *infants* to deduce and evidence it self from the considerations, which are thereunto annexed, both *negative* and *positive*, and then make triall how he shall be able to *demolish* that *structure* which is thus *founded* and *supported*; Meanwhile I shall now consider the *severals* of his exceptions, having premised thus much in *generall*.

### SECT. 3.

*The Jewes Baptisme of natives as well as proselytes. Testimonies of their writers in proof thereof. Baptisme among the heathens taken from the Jewes. Among both from Noahs flood. The derivation of Christian from Jewish Baptisme how manifested. Christs answer to Nicodemus. Baptisme a signum to the deluge. Gr. Nazianzen's and Macarius's testimonies. The Fathers meaning in affirming the Christians baptism to be in stead of Circumcision. The Lords Supper founded in the Jewes Pasceum, yet in stead of their Pasceover.*

1. **A**ND first he will abbreviate and give the Reader the substance of my proof, which he conceives to be this, *that the Jewes were wont when they admitted proselytes to baptize them and their children.* Here again at the entrance I must interpose, that



that his *Epitome* hath done some *injurie* to the *Book*, left out one considerable, if not *principal* part, *viz.* that which concerned the *Native Jewish* children, who were *baptized* as solemnly, as the *Proselytes* and their *children*.

2. This must be here taken notice of, because Mr. T. makes haste to assume the *contrary*, that the *Jews* baptized not *Jews* by nature, p. 306. that after the baptism *Exo* 19. 10. the *Jews* did not baptize *Jews* but only *proselytes*, p. 307. and so makes a shift to conclude, that by my arguing, the children of those that were baptized in infancy ought not to be baptized, and so that no infant of *Christian* race, or descended from *Christian* ancestors, is now to be baptized, p. 308. no infants but at the first conversion of the parent, p. 309. And this I was many moneths before the publication of his book, warned to expect from Mr. T. as an irrefutable answer to my way of defending infant baptism, mentioned by him in the *pulpit*, as ready to be published, that by deducing the baptism of *Christians* from the *Jewish* custom of baptizing of *proselytes* I had excluded all the children of *Christian* ancestors from our baptism.
3. But as this was then a great surprise to me, who knew that I had cleared that *Judaical* baptism to belong to the children of all *native Jews*, as well as of *proselytes*, so now I could not but wonder to find there was so perfect truth in that relation, which I had received, and have no more to say, but to desire the Reader to cast his eyes upon that *Treatise*, and inform himself whether I have not as punctually deduced from the *Jewish* writers the customary baptism of *native Jewish* infants, as I have done the baptism of *proselytes* and their children, and indeed mentioned the former as the original from which the latter was to be transcribed, and so as the foundation and groundwork of that other.
4. 'Tis unreasonable to recite here what is there so visible, yet because I see it is not taken notice of, but the contrary assumed for granted, and the chief weight of his 24<sup>th</sup> Chapter laid upon that supposition, there is nothing left me to do in this matter, but to transcribe my words from that 6<sup>th</sup> §. which are expressly these:
5. First then, Baptism or washing of the whole body was a *Jewish* solemnity, by which the *native Jews* were entred into the covenant of God made with them by *Moses*, so saith the *Talmud* &c.

*Repud: Israel or the Israelites do not enter into covenant but by these three things; by circumcision וּבְטָבִילָה and by baptizing, and by peace offering. So in Gemara ad tit. Cherithoth, c. 2: your fathers, i. e. the Jewes of old time did not enter into the covenant בְּמִלָּה וּבְטָבִילָה but by circumcision and baptism, and in Talmoth, c. 4. Rabbi Joshua said, we find of our mother that they were baptized (שָׁטְבִילָה) and not circumcised, so Maimonides tit: Ifuribia, c. 13. By three things the Israelites entred into the covenant, by circumcision, baptism and sacrifice, and soon after, what was done to you, to the Jewes in universum, ye were initiated into the Covenant by circumcision וּבְטָבִילָה and baptism and sacrifice. All these Testimonies there thus set down, and then how could I conclude lesse then there I do, that nothing can be more clearly affirmed by them, i. e. by the Jewish writings of the greatest authority among them, the Talmud, Gemara, and Maimonides?*

6. If this were not sufficient, then follows § II. as a third thing observable in this baptism among the Jewes, that the baptism of the natives was the pattern, by which the baptism of proselytes was regulated, and wherein it was founded, and this made evident by the arguing, and determining the question, in the Gemara, tit: Talmoth, c. 4. after this manner, *Of him that was circumcised and not baptized Rabbi Eliezer said that he was a Proselyte, because, said he, we find of our Fathers (Abraham Isaac—) that they were circumcised but not baptized; And of him that was baptized and not circumcised Rabbi Joshua said, he was a proselyte, because said he, we find of our mothers that they were baptized and not circumcised: But the wise men pronounced that till he were baptized and circumcised he was not a proselyte, where the example of the Jewes is the rule by which the obligation of the proselytes is measured.*

7. And the same is evident by the reason rendred by the Jewish writers of their baptizing the proselytes, which is generally taken by them from that command, Numb. 15. 15. *One ordinance shall be both for you, of the congregation, and also for the stranger (i. e. גֵּר the proselyte) that sojourneth with you, an ordinance for ever in your generations, as ye are, so shall the stranger be before the Lord, one law and one manner (i. e. one עֲשֵׂה and one דִּבְרָא*

*Luke*

*Luke 1. 6. one Law for moral duties, and one ordinance for rituals or ceremonies) shall be for you and for the stranger that sojourneth with you. Thus the Gemara tit: Cheritboth, c. 2. foundeth the circumcising and baptizing of profelytes, upon those words, As to you, so shall it be to the profelyte. So Maimonides tit: Isuri bia, c. 13. In like manner through all ages as oft as a Gentile will enter into the Covenant, and receive the yoke of the Law upon him, it was necessary that circumcision and baptisme should be used for him, beside sprinkling of the sacrifice, and if it were a woman, baptisme and sacrifice, According as it is said (Numb. 15. 15.) as to you, so also to the profelytes.*

8. And yet farther, as to the original of this baptisme among the Jewes themselves, the 12. 5. out of their writers deduceth it from the time of giving the Law in Mount Sinai, Exo. 19. 10. when God, to prepare them for the receiving it, commands Moses, Go to the people and sanctifie them to day and to morrow, and let them wash their clothes. So saith Maimonides Isuri bia, c. 13. But baptisme was in the desert before the giving of the Law, according as it is said, Thou shalt sanctifie them— And that agreeable to what we read of Jacob to his household, Gen. 35. 2. Put away the strange Gods that are among you, and be clean and change your garments (where being clean is answerable to being sanctified or baptized, and changing to washing their garments) so that as the covenant made with Abraham was sealed by circumcision, so the giving of the Law which was the Covenant made by God with all the people, was thought to be sealed by baptisme, and that the washing, if not of the whole, yet of some parts of the body (ordinarily called טוּרְפִּיּוֹת sanctifications) and the washing (or wearing clean) garments also.
9. And now I may, I hope, assume, that not onely there is perfect truth in what I now affirme, that baptisme among the Jewes, belonged to their natives as well as to profelytes (even to all that entered into the Covenant, and those evidently were the Jewish children as well as men) but also that this had before been evidenced in that *Resol: of the 4<sup>th</sup> Quere*, which here Mr. T. hath been pleased to examine, and consequently that it was no small injustice, and unkindness in him both to the reader, and to me, that he would omit to take notice of it, but assume and build on it as a

thing yielded and granted him by my discourse that the *profelytes* onely, and not the *native Jewes* were partakers of that *Jewish baptisme*.

This sure was a strange infirmity in an answer, and that which must needs have a special influence upon it, in any impartial weighing, even such an one, as will make it very unnecessary for me to consider any of his other considerations which he hath offered in that matter, which must certainly have no force in them, when that which is such a principal part of my arguing is so perfectly omitted, and the contrary supposed by him.

10. However I shall not refuse to attend him in all his motions, and inquire whether there be any particular pitcht on by him, which may deserve our farther consideration, in order to the point in hand, that of *Infant baptisme* among *Christians*.

11. And 1. saith he, *Baptisme, it seems, was a custome of all nations as well as the Jewes*, citing *Grotius* for it on *Mat. 3. 6.* and *Mat. 28. 19.*

12. Of the truth of this observation I shall raise no question, onely I wonder what he could phantasie from thence to conclude for his advantage. Certainly he will not hope by that argument to evince the negative, that it was not used among the *Jewes*, for how can the *Gentiles*, using it conclude, against all other evidence, that the *Jewes* did not use it? Nor can he pretend that *Christ* transcribed it from those *Gentiles*, and not from the *Jewes*: for *Christ* preaching, as he was sent, to the lost sheep of the house of *Israel*, and *ὡς πρῶτον*, to them first, *Act. 3. 26.* and if not to them onely, yet in a far more eminent manner to them then to any others, and accordingly adapting his Reformation to the *Jewish Religion*, and lightly deducing so many other customs from the *Jewes*, and none from the *Gentiles*, can with no probability be conceived to deduce this from the *Gentiles*, rather then from the *Jewes*, especially when (as *Clement* observes, *Ἐκλήρωται δὲ καὶ ἡ ἡμετέρα*), the heathens borrowed or stole both their learning, and their custome from the *Jewes*, so) it is very obvious to imagine, that this of baptisme, purgations and lustrations might by those heathens be borrowed from the *Jewes*, at least by both of them be derived from the same common fountain, the founnes of *Noah*, in remembrance of the deluge, according to that famous verse among the

the *Greeke*, θάλασσα κλύζει πάντα τ' ἀνθρώπων καὶ the *sea sweeps away all the evils of men*, to which *S. Peter* alludes in making *baptisme* the ἀντίτυπον to *Noah's flood* (as he hath himself cited it out of *Grotius*,) and so in like manner some of the *Fathers*, as *Arhanasius*, in his *χρησ. εἰς ἑρμην. πατρίβ. Tom. 2. p. 426. Πρῶτον βάπτισμα τὸ εἰς κατακλυσμὸν εἰς ἐκκοπήν ἀμαρτίας*, *The first baptisme is that of the deluge for the excision of sinnes.*

13. And if neither of these be hence deducible, that it matters little what else he can design to infer from it. And so sure there was some want of *answers*, when this (so nothing to the matter on either side) was thought fit to *march* in the *front* of them.
14. Under this head of *answer*, he presently addes, that he doth not know that *Dr. H.* or any other hath alleged one passage in *Scripture*, or any of the *Fathers*, that might evince that the *custome* of baptizing, or baptizing infants was derived from the *Jewes* initiating proselytes by *baptisme*.
15. To this I answer, 1. By asking *Mr. T.* whether he be ready to pay that *reverence* to the *authority* of the *Fathers*, as to be concluded by their *affirmations*? If he be, I wonder why the *uniforment consent* of them, that *infants* are to be *baptized*, should not prevaile with him: If he be not, why doth he mention this as *usefull* in this matter?
16. But then 2<sup>dly</sup>. It must be adverted, that this *one* containing two questions in it, 1. Whether this of *initiating* into the *Covenant* by *baptisme* were a *Jewish custome*? 2. Whether from thence *Christ* derived this rite of *baptizing* of *Christians*? The former of these was that which alone required *proving*, the latter being of it self *evident*, without farther *probation*, supposing one-ly that the *Fathers* testified that to be *Christ's institution* of *baptisme*, which we find to have been thus agreeable to the *practice* customary among the *Jews*.
17. As for example, if it were made matter of *doubt* or *question*, whether *Christ* derived the *Censures* of his *Church* from the *Jews*, It will sure be a sufficient *answer* to the *question*, if we shall first find in the *Jewish writers* their *customes* of *Excommunication*, and then from the *Christian writers* find the like *records* of the *Christian custome*, from the *institution* of *Christ*, and the *practice* of his *Apostles*, delivered down unto us; For those

two things being done, what need we any *Father's* assistance or guidance, to secure us, that *Christ* derived, and lightly changed this *custome* of *Ecclesiasticall censures* in his *Church*, from what he found in the *Jewish Sanhedrim*?

18. In this matter 'tis easy and obvious to object (as *M. T.* here doth about *baptisme*) that *excommunication* was a *custome* among other *nations*, as well as the *Jews*, the description of it among the *Druids* in *Cesar's Commentaries* being so famous and notorious to every man: which yet will not sure prevaile with any *reasonable* man, or make it necessary to produce the testimonies whether of *Scriptures* or *Fathers*, that *Christ* took it not from the *Druids* but the *Jewes*. The like might be instanced again in the institution of the *Sacrament* of the *Lords Supper* in the *Jews postcænum*, from which it is by light change deduced.
19. And so it is in this matter of *baptisme*, the *Jewish* custome of baptizing (not onely *profelytes* and their *children*, but the *Jewish natives*), I thought necessary to clear from the most competent *nitneses* of their *customs*, the *Talmud*, *Gemara*, and *Maimonides*, the soberest of their writers; And so likewise in the second place, the *practice* of the *Christian Church*, as it is from *Christ* and his *Apostles* deduced, and applied particularly to the Resolution of our *Quære*, to the baptizing of *Infants*, I have cleared also from some footsteps of it in the *Scripture* it self, and from the *concordant testimony* of the *Fathers* of the *Church*. And having cleared these two *particulars*, wherein all the difficulty consisted, I need not sure inquire of the *opinion* of *antiquity* for the dependence betwixt these two, or the *derivation* of one of them from the other, the very *lineaments* and *features* acknowledging and owning this *progenie* to have come forth from that *stock*, this *stream* to have been derived from that *fountain*, without any *testimonials* to certifie it.
20. And yet 3<sup>dy</sup>. After all this. I demand whether *Christ's* words to *Nicodemus*, *Jh. 3.* mentioned §. 8. be not an evidence from *Scripture* it self of this very matter, the *derivation* of the *Christian* from the *Jen sh baptisme*; when upon *Christ's* discourse on that subject, that except a man be regenerate of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdome of God, and on occasion of *Nicodemus's* objection against this v. 9. *Iesus* answered,  
*Ans*

Art thou a master in Israel, and knowest not these things? discernibly intimating that this his institution of baptisme was so agreeable to the Jewish customes of initiating, and receiving into the Covenant by baptisme, that a Rabbi among the Jews could not reasonably be imagined to be ignorant of it.

21. And if the baptisme of the Jews had (as Mr. T. cites it out of Grotius) its first original from the memorie of the deluge purging away the sins of the world, then sure that place of S. Peter which affirms the Christian baptisme to be *antitypū*, the *antitype* or *transcript* of Noah's deluge, is an expresse testimony of it also. And this I hope might be a competent account of this matter.
22. And yet after all this, it is also clear, that the Fathers in their discourses of baptisme do ordinarily lay the foundation of it in Moses, or the baptisme of the Jews; witness Gregory Nazianzen Or. 39. Seeing, saith he, it is the feast of Christ's baptisme, let us philosophize, discourse exactly of the difference of baptisms, then after this preface entring on the discourse, he thus begins, *Ἐβάπτισεν Μωϋσῆς ἀλλ' ἐν ὕδατι, καὶ πρὶν τούτοις ἐν νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν θαλάσσῃ*, Moses, saith he, baptized but in water, and before this in the cloud and in the sea, And then making that (with S. Paul) a type of the Christian baptisme, he proceeds to John's baptisme, which, saith he, differed from the Mosaicall, in that it added Repentance to water, *Ἐβάπτισεν καὶ Ἰωάννης, ἐκείνους δὲ ἰουδαϊκῶς*, John also baptized, but not Iudaically.
23. So before him, Macarius Hom. 32. having mentioned the circumcision which was under the Law forefiguifying the true circumcision of the heart, annexes thereto καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα τῷ νόμῳ, the baptisme of the Law, which saith he, *σχία ἐστὶ τῶν ἀληθινῶν πραγμάτων* is a figure of true things, *ἐκείνῳ δὲ σῶμα ἀπὸ πλυσαν, ὃ δὲ δὲ τὸ ἱερὸν πομῖνον νῦν βάπτισμα πυρὸς καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου καθαρίζει καὶ ἀποπλύνει*, for there that washed the body, but here the baptisme of the holy Ghost and of fire purgeth and washeth the polluted mind, and so goes on to the parallel betwixt the legall Priest and Christ, making the same accord betwixt the one and the other pair, So Hom. 47. p. 509. speaking of things under the Law, he first mentions the glory of Moses face, a type of the true glory under the Gospel. 1. Circumcision. a type of that of the heart; 3. *κατ' αὐτοῖς βάπτισμα*, saith he, *τῷ ἁγίῳ ἁγιάζον*, among  
C them



them there is baptisme cleansing or sanctifying the flesh, but with in the baptisme of the holy Spirit and of fire, that which John preached — The same is intimated again, but not so explicitly set down *Hom. 26. p. 349.* Πέδς Μωσῆς διαδέξατο, τῷ χαρίῳ ἐκκλησίαν Χριστοῦ, καὶ τῷ ἀληθινῷ ἱερουργίᾳ ἐγχευομένης, οὗν γὰρ ἐστὶ βάπτισμα πνεύματος καὶ πυρός, θελομένην ἐν καρδίᾳ νομοῦν, Peter succeeded Moses, having the New Church of Christ and the true Priesthood committed to him, for now is the baptisme of fire and the Spirit, and a kind of circumcision placed in the heart, where it seems the Jewish baptisme was the figure of the Christian, as the Jewish priesthood of the Christian, and the Jewish circumcision of the circumcision in the heart.

24. So in *Athanasius's* ῥήσεις καὶ ἔργα : παραβολαί : ἀγγ. γκ. 103.

\* *Tom. 2.*  
P. 426.

\* numbring up seven sorts of Baptisme, the first even now mentioned, τὸ ἐν κατακλυσμῷ εἰς ἐκκοπήν ἀμαρτίας, that of the flood for the cutting off of sin, the second that of Moses, in passing thro the Red sea, which he calls, πικρὸν, figurative; the third is τὸ νομικὸν βάπτισμα the legall baptisme, ὅπου ἔχον οἱ Ἑβραῖοι, which the Hebrews had, whereby every unclean person (so is every one by nature) ἐλθὼν ὑδάτι, ἐκδύετο τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὅπως εἰσῆλθον εἰς παρεμβολὴν, was baptized in water, had his garments washed, and so entered into the campe, this it seems the ceremonie of his admission. And then follows the baptisme of John and Christ. Other examples I doubt not the Reader may observe in the *Fathers* writings on this subject, these few may serve πρὸς δεξιάν.

25. And therefore when *Mr. T.* adds that some passages of the *Fathers* shew rather, that they took it as in stead of circumcision, the answer also is very obvious, that the *Jews* custome being to initiate by circumcision and baptisme both, and the former of these being laid aside by *Christ's* reformation, and onely the second continued, and that so improved by *Christ*, as to have more then the whole *virtue* of both, and to be the onely initial Sacrament, the *Fathers* might well learn of *S. Paul* to make this comparison or parallel betwixt the Jewish, and the Christian Sacrament, and so betwixt baptisme and circumcision, and indeed could not properly say that the Christian baptisme was in stead of the Jewish baptisme being rather the continuance of it, adding some ceremonies and *virtue* to that which was formerly among them,

not



- not substituting somewhat else (as for *circumcision* it did) in stead of it.
26. This is evident enough, and yet if it were not we should have little reason to be moved with this *suggestion*, knowing that in the other Sacrament which Christ visibly instituted in the Jewish *postcænium*, and imitated it in the delivering the portions of bread and wine, the *Fathers* generally lay the comparison betwixt the *Paschal Lamb* and that, and not without the authority of S. Paul himself, saying that Christ our *Passover* is sacrificed for us, the plain meaning of it being this, that the Jewish *Passover* being abolished, we have now the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ (the true immaculate lamb of God) substituted in the stead of it, but that copied out not from the Jewish manner of eating the Lamb of *Passover* (for Christ did not eat it at that time, being put to death before the hour in which it was to be eaten) but of the *postcænium* or close of the Jewish Supper, after which he took bread &c. consecrating this ordinary custome of theirs into a higher *mysterie*, then formerly it had in it.

#### SECT. 4.

The concepts of *Pet. Alfonsus* and *Schickard* of the Jewish baptism. *Raf. Alphus*: Mr. T. his conclusion not inferred, The original of the Jewish Baptisme (the onely doubt) vindicated. *Jacob's* injunction to his family. Sanctifications *Exod. 19. 10.* differ from washing garments.

1. **W**Hat he next addes from *Mr. Selden*, of some that conceived the Jewish baptism in initiating of *proelytes* was in imitation of Christ's example (and so not Christ's of theirs) and of *Schickard* that conceives they added baptism to *circumcision*, to difference them from *Samaritans*, is too vain to deserve any other reply, then what he himself hath annext concerning the former, viz. that *Mr. Selden* (naming onely *Pet. Alfonsus* for this) doth not give any credit to him in it (but indeed disproves it, and addes *antidotes* to that poison, that without them I should not

p. 41. have thought likely to have wrought on any man.) And indeed so he doth also in plain terms concerning the latter, *de Synedr.* 1. 1. c. 3. *fateor me nondum illud aut eâ de re quicquam alibi legisse*, he never read that or any thing of that matter any where else.

2. To which I adde, that if the place in *Schickard* be examined, it will acknowledge it to be a *singular* concept and *invention* of his, and nothing else.
3. In his 5<sup>th</sup>. *Chap. de Reg. Ind.* he hath these words, *ad differentiam Samaritanorum addiderunt baptismum quendam de quo Raf. Alphes Tom. 2. p. 26. & ipse Talmud Mass. Jefamos fol. 47.* citing the words at large in *Hebrew*. But in those words, though they are by *Schickard* applied indefinitely, as if they were the testification of the whole foregoing proposition, yet the reader shall find no syllable to that purpose of differencing from *Samaritanes*, more then from all other men, but onely that when a *proselyte* is received he must be circumcised, and then *נתפס מסבירין* when he is cured, they shall baptize him in the presence of two wise men, saying, Behold he is as an *Israelite* in all things, or if she be a woman, the women lead her to the waters &c. A plain testimony (to the sense of those which we formerly produced) of baptizing both *Jews* and *proselytes* (for else how could the *proselyte*, upon receiving this, be said to be a *Israelite* in all things?) but no least intimation, that this was designed to distinguish them from *Samaritanes* peculiarly, but as that which was alwayes *customarie* among the *Jews*, at their entering into *Covenant* with God.

And then the *premises* being so groundlesse and frivolous, I shall not sure be concerned in any conclusion that *Mr. T.* shall inferre from them, which it seems, is to be this, that notwithstanding the Doctor's supposition that the whole *fabrick* of baptism is discernible to be built on that basis, the customary practice among the *Jews*, yet many will conceive it needs more proof then the bare recital of passages out of *Jewish* writers.

4. But *Mr. T.* must be much put to it, to shew in what mode and figure it is, that this conclusion is drawn out of these *premises*: Certainly none that my *Logick* hath afforded me, for that hath no engine first to draw many out of two; nor 2. to inferre that those that

that had mistaken for want of *knowledge* (as *Alphonsus*) or *adverting* (as *Schickard*) of the *Jewish customs*, would need any more then the *recitation* of clear *testimonies* out of the *soberest Jewish writers*, to disabuse him: or 3. that they that either through *prejudice*, or any other *principle of obstinacie* shall resist this *degree* of light thus offered them, will be convinced by any other sort of *testimonies*, whether out of the *Fathers*, or *Scripture* it self, being so well fortified and provided with *inclinations*, at least if not with *artifices*, to *reject* one, or *misinterpret* the other.

5. But, it seems, after all this, and to evidence to how little purpose he hath said thus much, *Mr. T.* is well enough satisfied, at least as farre as to *baptizing* of *profelytes*, that there was such a *custome* among the *latter Jewes* afore *Christs incarnation*; All the *difficulty*, saith he, is concerning the *original* of it among them, For that either it should begin from *Iacobs injunction* to his household, *Gen. 35. 2.* or from *Gods command* *Exo. 19 10.* for the *Israelites* to wash their clothes afore the giving of the law, he cannot conceive, those places speaking of washing *Jewes* by nature, not *profelytes*, whereas the *Jewes* baptized not *Jewes* by nature (as *Mr. Selden* saith) but by profession.
6. Here are many weak parts in these few words; For 1. The *original* of the *custome* among the *Jewes* is but an *accessarie*, wholly extrinsecal to the matter in hand, and in no respect necessary to be defined by us: If the *custome* be acknowledged, we need ask no more, and *Mr. T.* having acknowledged the *custome*, grants all that in that matter we require of him, for on that, and not on that particular *original* of it, it is that we superstruct our whole *fabrick*, as farre as belongs to *infant baptisme*, which is very fitly founded in the *Jewish custome* of *baptizing*, from whence soever that *custome* was derived to them, And so that one thing supercedes and answers that whole difficulty, if indeed there were any such in this matter.
7. But then 2<sup>dy</sup>. for the two *originals* here set down and both rejected by him, it is a little strange that he should think fit to do so, and not to substitute any *third* in the place of them; For tis certain that every *custome* received *universally* into a *Church* or *Society* of men, must have some *originall* or other, and consequently

this *custome* being by Mr. T. acknowledged, must not in any reason be left *ἀνέλεος, ἀνίστασθαι, without Father, without Mother*, without any *original*; and therefore those two that are alleged for it by the *Jewish writers*, being by him so *fastidiously* rejected, it was very fit that he should assign some other, and annex his reasons of giving it the *deference*, upon which it should be prefer'd before them.

8. And when he shall do so, I shall not doubt to *imbrace* it, and make the same *advantage* of it which hitherto I have done of either of these. But he is here pleased to be *reserved*, and gives not the least *intimation* of any other *reason*, which is more suitable with his *conceptions*. 'Tis true indeed he did before out of *Grotius*, mention *Noahs flood*, in memorie of which this *custome* arose among other *nations*, but besides that this *original* of it was not by him deemed sufficient to appropriate it to the *Jewes*, but leaves it common to them with other *nations*, those other two, *Jacobs injunction*, and *Gods command* before receiving the *Law* (either one or both) are perfectly *reconcilable* with that, and the *memorie* of the *deluge* being the more *remote* and *first original*, these may be the *neerer* and more *immediate*, and so are not prejudged by his *pretending*, or my *yeelding* of that.

- 3<sup>dly</sup>. For *Jacobs injunction* to his household, *Gen. 35. 2.* it is no where vouched by me as the *original* of this *custome* among the *Jewes*, but onely an intimation given, that that other, the command of God before the giving the *Law*, was agreeable to what we read of *Jacob* to his household, and so certainly it is, for as in the one the ceremony prescribed them to use at the putting away strange Gods, was this, to be clean and change their garments; so in the other they are enjoined to sanctifie themselves and wash their clothes, which is in other words directly the same thing: washing themselves and having clean garments being among the *Jewes* joyned together, and the witness of their garments prescribed in *baptisme* לקבל פני שכינה (saith the *Glosse* on *Gemara Babylon*, tit. *Iabimoth*) to receive the presence of the divine Majesty (just as in the *Christian Church* the *Dominica in albis*, white or *Whitsunday* was a special day for administration of *baptisme*, and the persons baptized were rhetorically stiled sometimes ἀσπες ἐξ ὕδατος ἀνατίλλοντες *stars rising out of the waters*, sometimes ἀσπερ-

ἀρεσπόνται τὰ κολυμβήδεα τὰ κρίνα the bright lilies of the font, as they are joyned together in *Proclus Orat.* 12. p. 384. and in *S. Chrysostome*, new lilies planted from the font, *Hom. 6. de resurr.* and accordingly on *Constantine's* great coyn, stamp in memory of his baptism, was ingraven (on one side) a pool of water with a lily grown out of it; (see *Jos: Scal: in Opus:*) and all these but figurative expressions of what *Chrysostome* more plainly sets down by τὸ λαμπρὸν ὅτε το περιβολαῖον ἐν δυνάμει their putting on white garments at the receiving of baptism, *Tract. de S. Pent.* for which *Jobins* in *Photius* hath λαμπροφόρην only.)

10. And then as *Jacob* vowed a vow to the Lord to give him the tenth of all, and accordingly God after instituted the tithes for the *Levites* portion, and so the latter of these was agreeable to the former, but yet the latter, viz. Gods institution, the original of the custome of tithing among the *Jewes*; so *Jacob* might injoyne his household that ceremonie of washing or baptism, and after that God injoyne it in giving the Law, and one of these be agreeable to the other, and yet the custome of baptism among the *Jewes* be derived onely from the latter, as from the peculiar original of it.

11. 4<sup>thly</sup>. The command of God, *Exod. 19. 10.* in which baptism is said to be founded by the *Jewes*, is not (as *Mr. T.* suggests) the command to the *Israelites* to wash their clothes (nothing but the custome of changing their garments can be founded in that) but the command to *Moses* to sanctifie them (*Go unto the people and sanctifie them to day and to morrow*) in the Hebrew notion of the word קָדַשׁ, sanctifications, for washing, either the whole, or some parts of the body, as is shew'd at large, S. 35.

12. And if in stead of this of sanctifying, i. e. baptizing them, *Mr. T.* did unwittingly substitute washing their garments, then I hope, he may now be advised to reforme that mistake, and see more reason then hitherto he hath done, to assign that command of Gods, as the most agreeable original of this custome, and no longer imagine that it was a custome of the latter *Jewes*, taken up by themselves without any ground of Scripture; But if formerly he saw this, and was willing to disguise it, and, on purpose to misguide

misguide the reader, left out the mention of *Moses's sanctifying or baptizing* them, and onely set down the *washing* of their garments (which was not at all proper for the turn) to be the original of *baptisme*, wherein, as *Paulinus* tells us, they were rendered *nivei, white as snow, corpore* as well as *habitu, in body* as well as *garment*, I shall not then hope that even this length of words will be sufficient for his conviction.

13. *Lastly*, For his reason against deducing the *baptisme* of proselytes from this original [*because the Jewes baptized not Jewes by nature but by profession, whereas those places speake of washing Jewes by nature, not proselytes*] it will presently appear to be very vain; for 1. The Jewes baptized Jewes by nature, and not proselytes onely, as hath been both there and here shewed at large, out of the most creditable of the Jewish writers; 2<sup>dy</sup>. Their baptizing of proselytes was founded in their precedent custome of baptizing of Jewes, as hath been evidenced also from the Rabbines explication of Num. 15. 15. *One ordinance shall be both for you of the congregation of Israel, and also for the stranger or proselyte.* And so tis evident that of Exod. 19. 10. being the original of baptizing native Jewes, may, and must be the original of baptizing the proselytes.

14. And this in each part being thus manifest, Mr. *Selden's* authority (if it should be, as is pretended) can be of no force he gainst those evidences which I have here produced, the best offers us at any time, to prove any thing concerning the Jewish customes. And I shall now appeale to the Reader, whether Mr. T. could well have been expected to have made more misadventures in so few words.

SECT. 5.

*Mr. Selden's notion of the Sea. The defence of my notion of it. Learned mens affirmations to be judged of by their testimonies. Christ's baptizing of Jewes as well as Gentiles, no argument. Christ's vouching Iohns baptisme to be from heaven, no argument. No more, the pretended no intimations of it. The no conformity. The profelytes children baptized, continually, not onely at the first conversion. The baptisme of a woman with child, serving for the child also, not argumentative. The Canon of Neocæsarea about it.*

1. **N**Ext he proceeds to consider the words of the *Apostle*, 1 Cor. 10. 1. of our *Fathers* being baptized into *Moses* (as in the cloud, so) in the *Sea*. Where 1. He tells me that he doth not conceive *Mr. Seldens* exposition, that the sea was some vessell of waters — but the red sea ] And I that am as little of *Mr. Seldens* mind, but expiessely interpreted it, of the *Red sea*, §. 7. and rejected *Mr. Seldens* interpretation §. 8. (although I omitted to name the author of it) am not, he knows concerned in that, but have from his rejecting *Mr. Seldens* authority, when tis not for his turn, his example for my not thinking my self bound up by it at other times, either in that newly past, where he vouched his name as his onely proof, that the *Jewes* did not baptize *Jewes* by nature, or in other particulars which I find afterwards vouched from him, the truth of which I as little conceive, as *Mr. T.* doth this of the sea not signifying the *Red sea*, which I acknowledge to be unconceivable.
2. But then 2, he doth not think my exposition right neither (though I interpret it of the *Israelites* passing through the *Red sea*, as he acknowledges to do) But what is my interpretation? why, that their being baptized into *Moses* in the *Red sea* (as also in the cloud) signifyeth their being initiated into God's covenant under the conduct of *Moses*, as since they are wont to be initiated by baptisme. And why doth he dislike this interpretation? why, because when it is said, our fathers were baptized, it is not meant



*were baptized as since proselytes were baptized among the Jews, but as Christians were baptized.*

3. But certainly this is no reason of exception to my interpretation; For 1. I compare not this *baptisme* of our fathers in the sea with the *baptisme* of *proselytes* among the *Jewes*, but annex it immediately to the *baptizing* of the *native Jewes*, §. 6. before I proceed §. 9. to the *baptisme* of *proselytes*. And 2. I do not lay the comparison of the *Apostle* betwixt the *baptizing in the sea*, and the *Jewish custome of baptizing*, but acknowledge it to be betwixt the *baptisme* of the *Fathers* under the *Law*, and the *baptisme* since *Christ* among *Christians*. All the use I make of the words of the *Apostle*, was to shew that *baptisme* among the *Jewes* was a ceremonie of initiating into the covenant, and that upon that supposal it was, that the *Apostle* used the phrase of the *Israelites* that came out of *Egypt*, and entred into Covenant with him, under the conduct of *Moses*, God giving them an essay of his receiving them under his wings (the phrase to signifie reception into the covenant) by environing them with the sea. This I thought had been before intelligibly enough set down, I hope now he will no longer misunderstand it.
4. What he addes out of *Mr. S.* that after *Exo. 19. 10.* the *Jewes* did not baptize *Jewes* but onely *proselytes*, hath already been evidenced at large to have no truth in it, the custome of *baptisme* continuing to all their posterity, as well as that of *circumcision*. And whereas this is said to be set down thus out of *Maimonides* and other *Jewish Rabbines*, the Reader, if he will consult the place in *Mr. Selden de Synedr. l. 1. c. 3.* will find there is no such matter; That *Mr. S.* himself so affirms p. 23: I willingly acknowledge, but in a matter of ancient storie, such as this is, neither he nor any else must be believed farther then the testimonies produced by him out of their writers exact, especially against expresse testimonies to the contrary. And such he there produceth more then one, p. 34. out of *Gemara* מן אבותינו מה What did our Fathers? truly they entred not into Covenant without *circumcision* and *baptisme* and sprinkling of blood, and again p. 35. our mothers were baptized and not circumcised, and p. 26. out of *Viloria Porchetus*, that our mothers (though not as he saith, *Sara* and *Rebecca*, referring the custome to a greater antiquity then



then that of the time of giving the *Law* were baptized and not circumcised, and p. 38. out of *Maimonides*, that the *Israelites* entered into covenant by a threefold rite or ceremony, by circumcision, baptism, and oblation. And again, p. 39. *What was done to you? ye entered into covenant by circumcision, baptism, and he sprinkling of the sacrifice, and therefore the proselyte* — the custome of baptizing the proselytes founded in that of baptizing the native *Jewes*. All these clear testimonies are by him produced directly to the proof of my position, that the native *Jewes* (indifferently) were baptized, and not a word in any other parts of the testimonies to give reason to suspect, that after that one time of *Exo. 19.* the *Jewes* did not baptize. What he hath done in his other book *de Jure Nat. ac Gent.* I need not apprehend (and have not commodity to inquire or examine) supposing that if there he had undertaken the proof of it, he would here, where he affirms it without proof, and against expresse testimonies produced by him, have referred (according to custome) to that place.

5. And now what force against any pretension of ours is there in *Mr. T.* his observation that *Christ and his Apostles baptized Jewes as well as Gentiles?* For 1. so certainly they might, and yet derive their baptism from the custome formerly in use among the *Jewes*, for they, we know, baptized native *Jewes*: nay 2. so they might, though the *Jewes* had baptized none but proselytes, for to that it would bear just proportion, that they should baptize both *Jewes* and *Gentiles*, in case both came in as proselytes to *Christ*. For it were a fallacie a little too grosse to deceive any man of common understanding, to argue thus, The custome was to baptize proselytes, and not natives; therefore *Christ*, if he observed that custome, was not to baptize native *Jewes*; The answer being so obvious, by distinguishing of proselytes, that they are either such as come in to the *Jewish* religion, or such as came in to *Christ*, and that *Christ* was to baptize all that were proselytes to him, and that the native *Jewes* as many as believed on him, were such, and as believers, i. e. as proselytes to *Christ*, not as native *Jewes* were baptized by him.

6. Other reasons he hath chosen to annex for confirmation of his negative, that *Christ's* baptism was not in imitation of, or in conformity with the *Jewish* custome; for 2. saith he, *Christ* would

not have avouched the baptisme of Iohn to be from heaven and not from men, if it had been in imitation of the Jewish custome. But I wonder what appearance of concludencie there is in that reason? May not any thing be from heaven or by God's appointment, which is derived from a Jewish custome? may not God in heaven give commission to Iohn Baptist to preach repentance, after the same manner that others before him, Noah and Ionah &c. had preached repentance, and to receive all that came in on his preaching, by the ceremonie of baptizing ordinarily used, and known; to initiate men into covenant with God, among the Jewes? I see not the least incongruity in this, or that any obligation of reason can be pretended, why God may not appoint a ceremonie known among men to be used in his service: such sure was imposition of hands, usuall among the Jewes in benedictions, which now is made use of by the Apostles of Christ, in ordaining Bishops over the Church. And so it may well be in this matter of Iohn's or Christ's baptisme, which though it were unquestionably from heaven in respect of the Commission given to them by God, appointing them to do what they did, yet might the ceremonie of washing used by them be derived from the customes that were already familiar among them.

7. Twere easy to instance in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the power of the Keyes (and many the like) which though brought into the Church of Christians by Christ, and so from heaven, were yet derived and lightly changed from Jewish observances, and in that respect from men also.
8. His 3<sup>d</sup> reason, that it is likely some where or other some intimation would have been given of that custome, as the directorie for Christians in the use of baptisme] is too frivolous to require reply; for beside that the negative argument were of no force, if it were as is pretended, It already appears that there are in the Jewish writers, more then intimations of this custome, and some indications of it even in the Scripture itself, as John 3. 5. 10. and for any plainer affirmations, what need could there be of them, when both the matter it self speaketh it so plainly, that there was no need of words, to those that knew the Jewish customes, as the first writers and readers of the New Testament did, and when Christ's sole authority, and practice of his Apostles were sufficient Directorie for.

for the *Christians* in the use of *baptisme*?

9. Fourthly he addes, that the *institution and practice* would have been *conformable* to it; And so I say, and have made clear that it was, as far as to the *controverſie* in hand we are or can be concerned in it: But ſaith Mr. T. the *contrarie* appears, adding one main instance of the *inconformity*, and 14. *leſſer diſparities*, The *main diſparitie*, ſaith he, is in their *baptizing* no infants of the *Gentiles* at their *fiſt conversions*, whereas the *Jewes* baptized onely the *Gentiles* Infants at their *fiſt proſelyting*, not the infants of thoſe who were baptized in *infancie*.

10. For the former of theſe he offers no manner of *proof* beyond his own *affirmation*, and therefore it is ſufficient to *deny* it, as he knows we do, and evidently *beggs* the *queſtion* in *aſſuming* and not offering any *proof* for the contrary.

For the ſecond, that of the *Jewiſh practice*, he pretends no more then what he had before cited by *reference* ( but now ſets down in words ) viz. the *affirmation* of Mr. Selden.

11. But I have already ſhewed how groundleſſe that *affirmation* of Mr. S. was, as to the *native Jewes children*, who were ſtill baptized after the giving of the *Law*. And the ſame I now add for the *children* of thoſe *proſelytes* who had been baptized in *infancie*, there appears not the leaſt *proof* of this from the *Jewiſh* writers, who are the onely competent *witneſſes* in it, but for the contrary I propoſe theſe two *teſtimonies* taken notice of by Mr. S. himſelf de *Synedr.* c. 3. out of *Gemara Babylon*: לטולם חתן גר He wants the rite of a *proſelyte* for ever, unleſs he be baptized and circumciſed. Here *baptiſme* and *circumciſion* are joyned together, as equally neceſſary to a *proſelyte*, and that for ever. And *circumciſion* there is no doubt was to be received by every *male*, not onely at their *fiſt* coming to the *Church* of the *Jewes*, at their *fiſt proſelytiſme*, but through all *poſterities*, every child of a *proſelyte* that was not circumciſed גר חתן became ſtraightways no *proſelyte*: And then ſure this conjunction of *baptiſme* with *circumciſion* on theſe termes of *equality*, both of *perpetual neceſſity* to all *proſelytes*, muſt needs extend the *baptiſme* as well as the *circumciſion* beyond the *fiſt proſelytes* and their *immediate children*, to all their *poſteritie* that ſhall come from them afterwards, for to all thoſe belonged *circumciſion*.

12. So again in the same place, וְכִיוֹן דְּלֹא שְׂבִיל גִּי חָזָא, *and if he be not baptized, he remains a Pagan or Gentile*; Here I shall ask, whether the *child* of a *profelyte* who had been *baptized* in his *infancie*, were to be a *Pagan for ever*? I suppose it will be answered, no; And then by the force of that *testimonie* of *Gemara* I conclude, therefore it must be supposed that he was *baptized*, for else he would be a *pagan for ever*.

13. Besides this, two things I farther adde, to remove all possible force of this *suggestion*; 1. That if it were granted in the full *latitude* wherein it is proposed, that the *Jewes* *baptized* no other *infants* of *profelytes*, but those whom they had at their *first conversion*; yet this would nothing profit Mr. T. For it were then obvious to affirm, that *Christ* who imitated the *Jewes* in that, and so *baptized* the *children* of *Christian profelytes*, did make some light change in this, and farther then the *pattern* before him afforded, *baptized* all the *posteritie* that should succeed them, and were born in the *Church* in their *infancie* also, the *reason* though not the *pattern* belonging equally to them as to the *children* of the *first profelytes*, and the *Jewish custome* of *baptizing* their *natives infants*, being fully home to it.

14. 2<sup>dy</sup>. That it being by all parts granted, that the *children* which the *profelytes* had at their *first profelytisme* were *baptized* among the *Jewes*, this is as evident a *confutation* of the *Antipadobaptist*, and so of Mr. T. as it would if all their *infants* to all *posteritie* were *baptized*: For by that very *baptizing* of the *infants* at their *first profelytisme*, it appears that *infants* may be *baptized*, for I hope those *profelytes infants* are *infants*; And if any *infants* may, and ought to be *baptized*, then are all their *pretensions destroyed*, whole onely interest it is to evince, that no *infants* must or may be *baptized*. And I hope this will be of some use to Mr. T. when he shall have considered it.

15. The onely way M. T. hath to confirme this of the *Jewes* not *baptizing* any *infants* of *profelytes* born after their *first conversion* and *baptisme*, is the *resolution* of the *Jewes*, that if a *woman* *great with child* became a *profelyte* and were *baptized*, her *child* needs not *baptisme* when tis born. And this I had cited, §. 109. out of the *Rabbines*, and so indeed I find it in *Maimonides*, tit. *Isurib*. c. 13. וְיִבְרָח שְׁנֵתָן יוֹדָה וְשִׁבְלָה אֵין בְּנָה צָרִיד שְׂבִילָה.

But I cannot think that (whether true or false) a sufficient proof to inferre the *conclusion*; For the *Jewish Doctors* might probably thus resolve upon this other ground, because the *mother* and the *child* in her wombe being esteemed as *one person*, the *woman* great with *child* being *baptized*, they might deem the *child* *baptized* as well as the *woman*, and not account it needfull to *repeat* it after the *birth*, which yet (by the way) it seems they would have done, if they had not deemed the *childe* all one with the *mother*, and consequently they must be supposed to *baptize* those *children* which were begotten to the *proselyte* after the time of his or her first *conversion* and *baptisme*. And accordingly the *Christian Doctors* in the *Council of Neocæsarea Can. 6.* having resolved the *contrary* to that *Jewish hypothesis*, viz. that ἡ δὲν κοίτουσιν ἡ μήτηρ τῷ τέκνῳ, the *mother* that *bears* the *childe* differs from the *childe*, or is not all one with it, and her *confession* in *baptisme* is *idia* proper or *particular* to her self, and belongs not to the *childe* in her womb, give the (νομοποιῶν) the *woman* that is with *childe*, and is then *converted* to the *faith*, leave to be *baptized*, when she pleases, supposing that the *childe* which then she carries, shall, notwithstanding her *baptisme* then, be it self *baptized* after its *birth*.

16. Which as it is a cleer answer to the argument deduced from the resolution of the *Jewes* in that point, so it is moreover an evidence how little of proof Mr. T. had either from his own observation or Mr. Seldens testimonies, from all which he can produce no other but this, which in the sound is so far from affirming what he would have, and upon examination is found to conclude the *contrary*.

## Sect. 6.

*Lesser inconformities no prejudice. Yet they do not all hold. Prayer the Christian sacrifice. פָּרַחַת. The rule of judging in this matter. Baptizing in the name of the Father &c. prescribed by Christ. So dipping or sprinkling. The Præb. Cat. misreported. Mr. Marshals covenanting.*

1. **T**His *grand disparity* then being cleared to be Mr. T. his mistake, I shall not need to attend his other instances of *disparity*, this accord which hath been already mentioned and vindicated, being sufficient to my pretensions, and no concernment of mine obliging me to believe or affirm, that the *parallel* holds any farther than *Christ* was pleased it should hold, and of that we are to judge by what the *Scriptures*, or *ancient Church* tells us was the *practice* of him, or his *Apostles*; For 1. the *Jewes* I doubt not, brought in many things of their own devising into this, as into other *institutions* of *God's*, and the latter *Jewes* more, as of the *profelytes* being so born again in *baptisme*, that lying with his *natural sister* was no incest, and the like: And 2. *Christ*, I doubt not, changed the *Jewish æconomy* in many things, as in laying aside *circumcision*, in *commissionating* his *disciples* to *baptize* (and they leaving it in the hands of the *Bishop*, and those to whom he should commit it, ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ ἐπισκόπου βαπτίζειν, it is not lawful to baptize without the *Bishop*, saith *Ignatius*) whereas it was not among the *Jewes* any part of the *Priests office*, any more then *circumcision* was; And so in many other particulars.

Ep: ad Smyrn:  
Edit: Voss: p. 6

2. But what prejudice is that to my *pretensions*, who affirm no more of the *accordance* betwixt the *Jewish* and *Christian practice*, then either by some *indications* in the *Scripture* it self, or by the *Christian Fathers* deductions from the *Apostles* times, appears to be meant by *Christ*, and practised by the *Apostles*; and then by the *Jewish writers* is as evident to have been in *use* among them.
3. And this is all the return I need make to his 14 *lesser disparities*,  
and

and all that he hath at large endeavoured to infer from them, supposing and granting them all to be such.

4. But yet it is evident that some of them are not such, As when
  1. he saith, *the baptisme of males must be with circumcision and an offering*, tis clear that, though 1. *circumcision* be laid aside by *Christ*, and 2. when it was used it had nothing to do with *baptisme*, yet as to the adjoyning of *offering*, or *sacrifice*, the parallel still holds, the *prayers* of the *Church* being the *Christian sacrifice*, and those in the *Christian Church* solemnly attendant on the administration of *baptisme*.
  5. So parallel to the court of three *Israelites*, by the confession or profession of whom (על עדה בן דין, saith *Maimonides*) the infant was baptized, we have now not only the whole *Church*, in the presence of whom tis publickly administered, and when more privately, yet in the presence of some *Christians*, who are afterwards, if there be any doubt, to testify their knowledge to the *Church*, but more particularly the *Godfathers*, and *Godmothers*, being themselves formerly baptized, do represent the *Church* of which they are members, meaning thereby the people of the *Church*, and the *Minister* commissioned thereto by the *Bishop*, represents the *Church* also, meaning the *Governors* thereof.
  6. But I shall not proceed to such superfluous considerations, and so I have no need of adding one word more of reply to his 24 Chap. (as far as I am concerned in it) unlesse it be to tell him that the *Bishops Canons* are not the rule by which I undertake to define, wherein the *Jewish custome* must be the pattern, wherein not; but (as he cannot but know, if he had read the resolution of the 4<sup>th</sup> *Quære*) the practice of the *Apostles* of *Christ*, by the testifications of the *Fathers* of the *Church* made known unto us, to which as I have reason to yield all authority, so I find the *Canons* and *rituals* as of this, so of all other *Churches* in the world (no one excepted) to bear perfect accordance therewith, in this particular of *infant baptisme* (though in other lesser particulars they differ many among themselves, and all from the *Jewish pattern*) And this I hope is a competent ground of my action, and such as may justify it to any *Christian* artist to be according to rules of right reason, of meekness, and sound doctrine, and no work of passion or prejudice or singularity, or (as Mr. T. suggests).



of the *Doctors own pleasure*, as if that were the *mutable principle* of all these *variations* from the *Jewish pattern*.

6. Of this score tis somewhat strange, which he thinks fit to adde concerning the forme of baptisme, *In the name of the Father and the Sonne and the Holy Ghost, In this one thing*, saith he, *which Christ did not prescribe, nor did the Apostles, that we find, so conceive it, yet, saith the Doctor Christs prescription must be indispensably used.*

7. In reply to this I shall not spend much time to evidence this forme to be *Christs prescription*; If the *expresse words* at his parting from the world, *Mat. 28. Go ye therefore, and teach, or receive to discipleship, all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost,* be not a prescription of Christs, and if the *universall doctrine* and continuall practice of the whole Church through all times, be not *testimonie sufficient* of the *Apostles* conceiving it thus, and a competent ground of the *indispensable* tining the use of it, I shall not hope to persuade with him, onely I shall mind him of the words of *S. Athanasius* in his *Epistle to Serapion* *Tom. I. p. 204.* 'Ο ἐς μὲν τῷ πατρὶς ὀνομα-  
τι βαπτίζουσιν, ἢ ἐς μὲν τῷ ὀνοματι τοῦ υἱοῦ, ἢ χωρὶς τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐν ταῖς καὶ ὑπὲρ λαμβάνει, ἀλλὰ κενὸς καὶ ἀτελής διαμένει, ἐν τῇ τριάδι γὰρ ἡ τελειότης ἔστι. He that is not baptized in the name of all three, receives nothing, remains empty and imperfect, For perfection is in the Trinity, no baptisme perfect, it seems, but that. And if this will not yet suffice, I shall then onely demand, whether he can produce so *expresse grounds* from *Christ*, or the *Apostles*, or the *Universal Church* of God through all ages, or from any one *ancient Father*, for his denying baptisme to infants.

8. What in this place he addes farther from me, out of the *Pra-  
ctical Catechisme*, that I confesse that by Christs appointment the baptizd was to be dipt in water, i. e. according to the *Primitive ancient custome* to be put under water, is a strange misreporting of my words, I wonder Mr. T. would be guilty of it. The words in the *Pract. Cat.* are visibly these, *By Christs appoint-  
ment whosoever should be thus received into his familie should be  
received with this ceremonie of water, therein to be dipt* (i. e. ac-  
cording to the *Primitive ancient custome* to be put under water)  
*three times, or in stead of that to be sprinkled with it* — where

I. All.



1. All that *Christ's* appointment is affixt to, is, the receiving all that should be received into *Christ's* familie, with this ceremonie of *Water*; 2. For the manner of that reception by water, tis set down disjunctively, therein to be dipt three times, or in stead of that to be sprinkled with it. These are evidently my words; no way affirming either the dipping or sprinkling (one exclusively to the other, to be appointed by *Christ*, but onely the ceremonie of water, whether it be by dipping in it or sprinkling with it, either of which may be signified by the word used from *Christ* by *S. Matthew*, βαπτίζω, baptize yee.
9. What ground the Church of *Christ* hath had to disuse immersion, and in stead of putting the whole body under water, only to dip the face, or sprinkle it with water, I shall not now discourse, all that I have to do in this place being to vindicate my self, that I have no way affirmed the putting under water (used by the Primitive Church) to be appointed by *Christ*, exclusively to sprinkling, and that I hope I have already done by the exact reciting of my words, which had been so much misreported by him.
10. And so I have done with his 24<sup>th</sup> Chapter. For as to the objection against Mr. *M.* drawn from his covenanting to performe the worship of God, according to Gods word, and admiring that ever mortal man should dare in Gods worship to meddle any jot farther then the Lord hath commanded, and yet in point of infant baptisme following the *Talmud*, I that am farre from Mr. *M.* his persuasions, as well as practices, am not sure bound to give answer for him, *Etatem habet, let him answer for himself*; and when he doth so, 'twere not amiss, he would consider, whether *Episcopal* government stand not on as firme a basis in the Church of God, as infant baptisme is by him vouched to do.

## CHAP. II.

## Of Christ's words, Mat. 28. 19.

## SECT. I.

*The Doctors pretended concessions examined. Christ's institution of baptisme not set down Mat. 28. but necessarily before that time.*

1. **HIS** 25. Chapter is a view of my interpretation of Mat. 28. 19. which lyes thus, *Goe and disciple (ua&ndi&Carr make disciples, receive into discipleship) all nations, baptizing them in the name &c. teaching them &c.* thereby evidencing that the making or receiving disciples, not supposing any precedent instruction, but looking wholly on it as subsequent, can no way exclude the Christians infants from baptisme, when they are thus brought to the Church to be entred into the School of Christ, and undertaken for that they shall learn when they come to years.

2. And to this a long proemial answer he hath of many lines, which begins thus, *Though I conceive Dr. H. to ascribe more power to the Canons of the Prelates about the Sacraments, then is meet, being one who hath written in defence of the Common Prayer Book, yet by this allegation of Mat. 28. 19. he seems tacitely to yield, that if the words there include not infants under the discipled, then there is something in the New Testament which excludes infants from baptisme, although he say s. 96. I do not believe or pretend that that precept of Christ doth necessarily inferre (though it do as little deny) that infants are to be baptized.*

3. Before I proceed to that which followes, 'tis not amiss to view in passing, how many incongruities are here amass'd together in these few words.

4. For whereas my having written in defence of the Common Prayer Book is made use of as an evidence to inferre that I ascribe more

more to the *Canons of Prelates*; then is meet, it is certain 1. that the *Common Prayer book* stands not by the *Canons* of the *Prelates*, but by *Act of Parliament*, and consequently if I had been guilty of a confessed partiality to the *Common Prayer book*, yet were this no evidence of my ascribing any thing (therefore sure not more then is meet or too much) to the *Canons of Prelates*.

5. 2<sup>d</sup>. It never yet appeared, that by writing in defence of the *Common Prayer book*, I offended at all (therefore surely not about either, much less against both the *Sacraments*.)
6. 3<sup>d</sup>. The making my defence of the *Common Prayer book*, written long ago, a proof that I offend now in somewhat else; viz. in attributing too much to the *Canons* of the *Bishop*, is 1. the connecting together things that are most disparate, concluding *quidlibet ex quolibet*; and 2<sup>d</sup> a plain begging of the question, for such certainly it is in respect of him, with whom he disputes, and so must be, till he shall offer proof that I have erred in that defence, The same, as if he should conclude, that he who hath once written the truth, were obliged the next time to swerve from it.
7. So when he mentions my allegation of *Mat. 28. 19.* the word *allegation* must signifie that I produce and so allege that text as a proof of my position: But this he knows I do not; But only suppose the *Antipodobaptist* to found his plea in it, and all that I have to do, is to shew how useles it is like to prove to him, confessing also that to me it is as uselesse, and so never attempting to draw any argument from it.
8. So again, when upon a supposition by him specified he assumes me to grant that which he acknowledgeth me expressly to deny, this sure is very incongruous: Tis visible from the words by me produced §. 96. that I deny that that text of *Mat. 28. 19.* can prejudice the *baptisme* of *infants*, and the only design I had in considering this text at all in this place, was to evidence the second branch of the negative part of my undertaking, that there appeared nothing in *Christ's* institution of *baptisme*, or commission to his *Apostles*, which was exclusive of *infants*: How then can it be suggested with any shew of truth, that I seem vacillate to yield, that if the words include not *infants* under the disciples, there is then something in the *New Testament* which excludes *infants* from *baptisme*.

9. 'Tis evident from whence it is that I infer, and positively define *Christs Commission* for *baptisme* to belong to *infants*, not from these words of *Christ* (which as I said, I never propos'd to that end to prove my position from them, but only to answer the *Antipadobaptists* objection founded in them) but from the *practice* of the *Apostles* signifying their *sense* and *persuasion* of *Christs* meaning in his *institution* of *baptisme*, which *institution* we know from *John 4. 1.* had long preceded the delivering of these words *Matth: 28.*
10. So that whatsoever were the notion of *discipling* there, yet could not I deem *infants* thereby excluded from *baptisme*, whom by another *medium*, viz. the *Apostolical practice*, I supposed to be admitted to it by *Christs institution*.
11. The short is, *Infants* I suppose may be received into *discipleship* when their parents bring them, and if so, then they are or may be included in the words *Mat. 28.* but if they might not, and so were supposed not to be comprehended in these words of *Christ*, *Mat. 28.* yet that which is not included, is not presently excluded, he that saith a *man* is a *living creature*, doth not thereby deny an *angel* to be so also: when *Christ* gives his *disciples* power to heal *diseases*, *Mat. 10. 1.* he cannot be deemed to withhold from them power of raising the *dead*, for that we see comprehended in their commission v. 8. and so I could no way be inforced to yield that they were excluded from *baptisme*, as long as from any other *medium* I were assured they were admitted to it.
12. And so still *undoubtedly*, here is not the least appearance of truth in this discourse.
13. He proceeds then to some other attempts of proving it necessary for me if I will stand to my words elsewhere, to acknowledge *infants* excluded by that text. To which end he hath been very diligent in putting together several scattered passages in my writing, in hope to finde some *irresolvable*, and to raise some show of argument out of my own words, and so from my *tendency* or *inconstancy* (for want of solid proofs) to conclude that if this precept of *Christ* doth not necessarily infer *infant baptism*, then by manifest consequence it doth deny it.
14. The passages he gathers up are these, *The Doctor saith, s. 55. that Christs institution makes dipping or sprinkling with water a Sacra-*

Sacrament, which institution is *Mat. 28. 19.* and therefore the Doctor will have the words there indispensably used in baptisme, and *S. 92.* he saith baptisme is a Sacrament, that Sacrament an institution of Christs, that institution not founded in any reason of immutable truth but only in the positive will of Christ, and so that there is nothing considerable in this question (or any of this nature) but how it was delivered by Christ, And *S. 94.* that which was done by the Apostles, if it were not a rule for ever, yet was an effect of such a rule formerly given by Christ, and interpretable by this practice to be so. And *Pract. Car. 1. 6. S. 2.* he expounding Christs institution, saith that the words import that the person baptized acknowledgeth, maketh profession of believing in three, delivereth him to three as authors of his faith, and to be ruled by the directions of his Master, and this he will have to be meant by baptizing into the name of the Father, Son, and holy Ghost.

15. These are the passages, whence, saith he, I infer that if baptisme be a Sacrament, and made so by Christs institution, and that institution founded only in his positive will, and the will of Christ be, that baptisme be in the name of the Trinity, and this is when the baptized makes profession of believing in three, to be ruled by them, and the Apostles practice interprets Christs rule, no infant that doth not profess faith, is baptized into the name of the Trinity, nor was appointed to be baptized by Christ, nor did the Apostles baptize them, and therefore they are not baptized according to Christs institution, and so no Sacrament to them.
16. Here is a very subtle fabrick and great pains taken to prove me to affirm exactly what I expressly deny: But herein though his pains be great, he hath much failed of the success, it were too long to shew it at large, yet the reader that will be at pains to survey his processe, will certainly acknowledge it, if he shall but remember these two things.
17. 1. That Christs institution of baptisme was not (nor is ever affirmed by me to be) set down in those words of *Mat. 28.* that having been long before instituted and practised, as appears by plain words *Joh. 4. 1, 2.* Secondly, That though Christs will and institution for baptizing infants be not so manifestly exprest in those words *Mat. 28. 19.* as shall be able by the bare force of the words

words to convince any gainsayer, without any other way of evidence or proof added to it, yet by the Apostles practice of baptizing infants (appearing to us by other means) it is most evident that they who certainly did not mistake Christs meaning, did thus understand and extend his institution and commission. The truth of this is there made evident §. 30. &c. I shall not here repeat it.

18. 2<sup>dly</sup>. That the infant when he is to be baptized, doth, though not by his own voice personally, yet by his lawful proxies, which the Church accepteth in his stead, profess the believing in three, the Father, Son, and holy Ghost, deliver himself up to three, &c.
19. By this clue the reader will easily extricate himself out of the Labyrinth there provided for him, if such it appear to be, and discern a perfect accordance in all the passages, which with such hope of advantage were so diligently collected by him.
20. But this is not all, he will yet drive the business somewhat higher in these words, *Tea, if the positive will of Christ. be the reason of baptism, they usurp upon Christs prerogative who baptize otherwise then Christ hath appointed, and then if the precept of Christ doth not necessarily infer infant baptism (which the Doctor ingeniously acknowledgeth) it doth by manifest consequence deny it, sith he forbids that to be done otherwise then he hath appointed when he hath determined how it should be done. The Doctor when he saith above, the words, [I baptize into the name of the Father &c.] must be indispensably used, we think by the same reason should conceive Christs institution should be unalterably used in baptizing those only whom he hath appointed to be baptized.*
21. To this the grounds of answer have been already laid also, viz. that they that baptize infants, baptize no otherwise, then Christ appointed and the Apostles appear to have understood his appointment. By Christs appointment, not meaning particularly his words Mat. 28. but his will otherwise made known to his disciples, when and in what words soever it was that he instituted baptism, which must be long before this, even before his Apostles took upon them to baptize any, which yet they did in great abundance Joh. 4.1. And of this appointment or institution of baptism

tisme by Christ, it is most true, that if that precept of Christ, whereby he first instituted baptisme, did not indeed comprehend and so necessarily inferre infant baptisme, and was so understood to do by the Apostles, it shall consequently be deemed to deny it. But then herein lyes a great fallacie, when from another appoinment of Christs, viz. that *Mat. 28.* which I acknowledge not to inferre infant baptisme necessarily, he assumes in universum, and reports it as my confession, that Christs precept (indefinitely taken, and so extending to all Christs precepts at any time) doth not necessarily inferre infant baptisme. Which is that grand illogical fault in discourse, of inferring an indefinite or universal conclusion from particular premisses.

22. As for the comparison which he makes betwixt the indispensable use of the words of baptisme *Mat. 28.* and the as unalterable observation of Christ's institution, in respect of the persons to be baptized, I willingly grant it, on the condition præmised, that he mistake not the text, *Mat. 28.* to be the words of that institution, wherein Christ defined, who are the persons to be baptized.
23. Those words are a commission to the Apostles to go preach to, or disciple all nations, and thus farre extends to point out the persons, viz. that they should (as disciple so) baptize Gentiles as well as Jewes, and again, they are exprels for the forme of baptisme, that it should be in the Name of the Father, the Sonne, and the Holy Ghost, but they are not any kind of direction to that other matter of receiving, and admitting infants or not infants.
24. That I suppose sufficiently notified to them before both by the common practice of their ancestors in the Jewish religion, by the vulgar notion of baptisme, whilest it was familiarly used among the Jewes, both to their own and their profelytes children, and also by Christs speciall direction (though the Gospels, which exprels not at all the words of the first institution of baptisme, do not set that down) in the time of his preaching among them, some while before that passage of storie related, *Joh. 4. 1. &c.*
25. From both of these, I suppose, the Apostles learnt it (and not from *Mat. 28.*) and we learn it only from the Apostles, as shall hereafter appear. And so much for his proœmial reasoning.



## Sect. 2.

*Making disciples all one with receiving into discipleship. Baptizing the act of the Baptist. Instruction subsequent to discipling. The pretended parallel between Mat. 28. and Mar. 16. Ευαγγελίζεσθαι Johns discipling by preaching excludes not infants. No more the Apostles, Mat. 10. 5. The notation of the word μαθητεύειν. Mat. 13. 52. Act. 14. 21. Infants both said to come and to believe. Instruction subsequent to baptisme.*

1. **A**fter this *præsumptorie* συνομαχία, he next proceeds to consider, what *shift* (as he calls it) the Doctor makes to elude the force of Christs institution, Mat. 28. 19. But I have already made it evident that that Commission for preaching to, or discipling all nations (as for the baptizing them, and the particularity of the forme to be used in baptisme, &c.) was not the institution of baptisme, nor any intimation on either side, whether infants should be baptized or not; and so tis manifest how little need I had to use any *shift*, or artifice to elude the force of it.
2. However in his view of my discourse some exceptions he must find; And the first is, that though μαθητεύειν is well rendered, *make disciples*, yet μαθητεύειν βαπτίζοντες is not well paraphrased by, *receiving into discipleship, baptizing them, making this forme of baptisme the ceremonie of receiving them.* For by this, saith he, the making disciples is made the same with receiving them, and baptisme the ceremonie of receivers into discipleship, which is as truly an act of the baptized professing, or avouching his discipleship.
3. Here is another *subtlety* of a refined nature, making a difference betwixt making disciples, and receiving into discipleship, or receiving disciples; As if these two were not perfectly synonymous, and by me evidently used, as such. I shall not dispute of words, when the matter is clear, and when it is equally to my purpose which phrase is used, whether making or receiving disciples.

2<sup>d</sup>y. When

4. 2<sup>dy</sup>. When he affirmes of *baptisme*, which I make the ceremony of the *Apostles* receiving them, that tis as truly the *act* of the *baptized*, this is no *subtily*, but *grasse* and visible enough; For certainly *baptisme* in the *active* sense (as it is plain I understand it in that place, where I *paraphrase*, *goe* and *make disciples* and *baptize*) is not the *act* of the *baptized*, but of the *baptist*; The *coming* to *baptisme* indeed, and the undertaking the *vow*, and making the *profession*, is the *act* of the *baptized*, either *personally*, or by his *proxy*, which in *reputation* of *Law*, and in *acceptation* of the *Church*, is his also, but still *baptisme*, or (to remove all possible mistake) *baptizing*, βαπτίζω, *Mat.* 28. 19. is an *act* of the *baptizer* onely, and so the ceremony of receiving into *discipleship*, whomsoever they thus duly *baptize*. I hope I need say no more of this.
5. His 2<sup>d</sup> branch of *exception* is to those words of mine wherein I say that the *making* or *receiving disciples*, supposeth not any *precedent instruction*, but lookes wholly on it as *subsequent*. This I there concluded not from the bare *negative*, because there was no *precedent* mention of such *instruction*, where *discipling* and *baptizing*, were both mention'd, but because in that place, on which the *Antipodobaptist* so much relies, *Mat.* 28. 19. the [*διδασκοντες teaching*] is expressly mentioned *after discipling* and *baptizing*, and so is in reason to be deemed, and lookt on, as *subsequent* to both, and so the *receiving ad discipulatum* referre to that then *future instruction*.
6. And to this sense I there made it manifest, that the definition of *baptisme* 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. did referre that, *baptisme* is ἐνσέμνια, *seeking* to God, as to the *oracle* to *inquire* for the whole *future life*, no way prerequiring *actual instruction*, but *coming* to *Christ* and the *Church* to receive it, and obey it for the *future* (and that done in some sort by those that are *brought*, when they are not able to *come*, and by the *charitie* of the *Church* received there) And this farther illustrated as by the manner of *children* brought by *parents* to *School*, without either *knowledge* of *letters*, or *choise*, or so much as *wish* of *instruction*, so by the manner of *Christ's disciples* being received by him, particularly of *Philip*, *Joh.* 1. 44. who was called, and received into *discipleship*, as soon as ever *Christ* met with him, i. e. before he was at all *instructed*

by him, and so also by the storie of the *Jewes*, *Exo.* 19. 8. who undertook to obey all the *Commandments* of *God*, which he should give them, which yet were not then, but after given them, v. 20. and so lastly by the nature of *profelytisme*, which as it is all one with entering into *God's* covenant and ( in the *Christian* sense ) with coming to *Christ* and being received to *discipleship*, so tis that which *children* are known to be capable of, not onely by that text, *Deut.* 29. 10. but by the custome of baptizing infant *profelytes* among the *Jewes*, and by *Christ's* command to suffer them to come unto him, whensoever they were thus brought.

7. Now to this thus evidenced (and much more largely in that place, §. 26. &c.) he is pleased to annex some reasons of his dissent, For, 1. saith he, that which is exprest in *Matthew* by, *Go ye therefore and make disciples all nations, is in Marke, Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature, which shewes how they should disciple all nations; Now they who are made disciples by preaching the Gospel are made disciples by precedent instruction, Ergo, the making or receiving disciples Mat.* 28. 19. supposeth precedent instruction.

8. But to this I answer, 1. That the words in *Marke* are no otherwise parallel to those in *Matthew*, then as an *Epitome* is parallel to a larger discourse, such we know *S. Markes* for the most part is an abbreviation of *S. Matthews Gospel*, as in many others, so in this particular, some passages indeed there are in *S. Mark* in this place, which are not in *S. Matthew*, as shall a non be shewed, but in the particular now before us, *S. Mark* is, according to wont, more concise; there is no mention in him of baptizing in the name of the Father and of the Son & of the holy Ghost, nor consequently of discipling, of which that was the ceremonie, as in *S. Matthew* there is.

9. 2<sup>dy</sup>. That *Christ's* appointment κηρύττειν εὐαγγέλιον, to preach the Gospel, in *S. Mark*, doth no way inferre the precedent instruction of every single person that was received to baptisme: The phrase signifies to proclaime or promulgate the happy tidings brought into the world by *Christ*, grace, and mercy, and eternal felicitie to all that should come into him and take his yoke upon them, and learn of him; And upon the publishing of this to all the world, to every creature, i. e. to the *Gentiles* universally, as well

well as the *Jewes*, I suppose tis very possible, that many of them should make all speed to come unto *Christ*, and come out at the *Apostles* preaching, they and their whole households together (*μαρὸν* as the oracle commanded in *Homer*) and to bring their infant children with them, as they used to do, that became *profelytes* to the *Jewes* and then the *Apostles*, knowing their *Masters* mind for the receiving of *Infants*, and that (as from the institution I suppose them fore-instructed) to *baptisme*, receive them all, and (as many as interposed no voluntary hindrance) baptize them, and having taken them into the *School* of *Christ* make good provision for the future instruction of them, as soon as ever they should be capable of it.

10. That thus it was I pretend not (still) to deduce from these words, *Mat.* 28. but to infer from another medium, the practice of the *Apostles*, otherwise notified to us: All that I am now to manifest, is, that this passage hath nothing contrary to our hypothesis, but is perfectly reconcileable with it, and this is done by the scheme thus laid: And so tis most visible how no force there is in this first reason of exception.
11. The 2<sup>d</sup> followes, that such as the making disciples was *Jo.* 4. 1. such is the making disciples *Mat.* 28: 19. For by the Doctors confession they are all one. But that was by preaching, as is plain concerning *John*, *Mat.* 3. 1, 2, 5, 6. and concerning the *Apostles*. *Mat.* 10. 5, 6, 7. Ergo.
12. To this I answer, that the account last given, is fully satisfactory to this exception also; For supposing the *Apostles* to publish whithersoever they came, the *Εὐαγγέλια* the good newes that was come into the world by *Christ*, and the hearers not only to come in themselves, but to bring their whole families, and so their infant children with them, there is no difficulty to imagine, that they that had thus made proclamation, received all, and made all disciples, young and old, that either came or were brought, and so it being granted that they made disciples by preaching, preaching being the instrument to draw the parents themselves, and to move them to bring their children to discipleship, it is still very visible how children should be disciplined, and consequently baptized by them, baptism being the constant ceremony of discipling. And though I am not able to affirm, how it was actually in *Johns* baptism, yet

this I may say, that as far as can be discerned or inferred from the phrase in either place, (*μαρτυρῶν* and *μαρτυρᾶς μισθῶν*) thus it very possibly might be both in *Johns* and in the *Apostles baptizing*.

12. First for *John*, 'tis true indeed that his *baptisme* attended his *preaching*, yet doth it not thence necessarily follow that none were *baptized* by him but those who particularly *heard* and obeyed his *preaching*; For 1. Why might not those that *heard* it, divulge it to others, and bring them *before* they *heard* him, to desire to be *baptized*, and upon their *confessing* their *sins*, and *professing* amendment, he *baptize* them? 2. Why might not those that *heard* it, or *heard* of it, give that heed of it, as to bring all that were *dear* to them of what *age* soever, by that means to secure them from the *wrath* to come; when *Noah* *preacht* *repentance* to the *old world*, and upon the decree of sending the *flood* upon the *world* of the *ungodly*, called all to come into the *Ark* to him to escape the deluge, suppose others besides *Noahs* family had hearkned to his *preaching*, or suppose he and his sons had had *infant children*, can we imagine they would have left their *infants* to that certain *ruine*, and not have taken them into the *ark* with them?
13. And *Johns baptisme* was answerable to that *ark*, in respect of that approaching ruine on the *Jewes*, styled the *kingdome of heaven* v. 1. and that evidenced to be a *bloody kingdome*, explicated by *casting into the fire* v. 10. And can we imagine the *Jews* that believed *John* and came to his *baptisme*, did not bring their *children* with them to *save* them from the *predicted evils*, And then I profess not to see any reason to render it incredible that *John Baptist* should thus *receive* and *baptize* those *infants* (though the *Scripture* affirming nothing of it, and *tradition*, as far as I know, as little, I shall neither affirm nor believe any thing in it) This only is certain, that among the *Jewes* of that time *infant Children* were known to be capable of *entring* into *covenant* with *God* after this manner, and of being partakers of the *benefit* of the *Covenant* by that means.
14. And one thing more I may adde, that *Christ* himself, who was by his *sinfulness*, as *unqualified* for the *Repentance* which *John* *preacht*, as the *infants* were by their incapacities, did yet come and was received to *Johns baptisme*, v. 13. and then in case  
*infants*

*infants* were brought, why might not they be received also ?

15. Then 2. for as much as concerned the *Apostles* *Mar. 10.* First, 'Tis there evident that they were sent to the *lost sheep indefinitely*, and sure that phrase comprehends the *Lambs* also, the *infant children* being lost in *Adam* as well as the *grown men*, by the addition of their *actual* to *original* fin : And then why should we doubt but the *Apostles mission* extended to *them* also ?
16. An 2. for their *preaching*, it is just as *Johns* was, to warn them to beware of the *imminent destruction*, that *vindicative* act of *Gods kingdom* v. 7. that all that should give ear and heed to them might hasten to get out of that *danger* by *reformation* and new life; and the *ruine* being impendent to the *young* as well as *old*, even the whole *nation*, why should not the *infant children* be rescued from that by their *parents* care in bringing them to *baptisme*, and timely ingaging them to *fly from the wrath to come*, as soon as they should come to *understanding*, injoying in the mean time the benefit of others *charity* ?
17. Thirdly, After their *preaching* though there be no mention of *baptizing* (and so it was not so fit to be produced to our present *business*) yet other things there are appointed to be done, wherein *infants* were concerned as well as others, as *healing of diseases* &c. and if being incapable of receiving *benefit* from *preaching* should be deemed an *obstacle* to their being *baptized*, why should it not to their receiving of *cures* ? Nay I may adde. How should the *dead* in that place (who sure were as incapable of *hearing* or *understanding* as the *tenderest infant*) be capable of being *raised* by those *Apostles*, which yet is there affirmed of them, v. 8.
18. And so much for that *reason* also, and in like manner for the third, which is but repeating the last branch of this second, that the *Apostles* were to *disciple all nations* by the *same way* that they *discipled the lost sheep of the house of Israel*, which was, saith he, by *preaching* and therefore supposed *precedent instruction*.
19. In what sense, I have now shewed, viz. by *preaching*, to the *nations*, and *receiving* all that came in, to the *discipleship*, whether on their own *legs*, or in others *arms*, whole *families* at once, the *parents*, and upon their *undertaking* their *infant children* also.
20. His fourth proof is taken from the *use and notation of the word*, which is so to teach as that they learn, and so, saith he, is used

used Mat. 13. 52. μαθηταῖς, is rendered, [instructed] by our last translators; and can be no otherwise rendered than [made a disciple by teaching] so Act. 14. 21. it is said, Having preached the Gospel to that city, καὶ μαθητεύσας and having taught or made many disciples.

21. For the notation of the word we have formerly said sufficient, that it signifies to receive ad *discipulatum*, as into a school of Spiritual instruction, μαθητῶν ποιῆν to make a disciple, and such he is made, who by any motive or means either comes or is brought into the school, this indeed in order to teaching in the Master, and to learning in the scholar, and the one so to teach, as that the other learn, but this subsequent to his being made a disciple, the youth we know enters into the school, is admitted into the College and University, before he learns a word there, the instruction or learning is still lookt upon as future, at his entering into discipleship.

22. And this is all the importance of the word μαθητεύειν Mat. 13. 5. only some accidental differences may be observed, 'tis in the passive, and in the Aorist in the preter tense, πῦς χαμματῶς μαθητεύσας εἰς τὸν βασιλεῖαν τῶν ἑγγύων every Scribe which is or hath been entred as a disciple unto the kingdome of heaven, who since his entrance hath been instructed and (as real passives import) received influence, been really affected and changed by discipleship, still no way supposing that he was instructed in the learning or mysteries of the kingdome of heaven, before he was thus admitted a disciple to it; After his admission, there is no doubt but he doth (or ought to) learn, nay being there χαμματῶς μαθητεύσας, a Scribe disciplined, a grown man and learned among the Jews, before he came to Christ, I doubt not but some knowledge he had of it before he entred himself a disciple (see baptizing of infants, p. 199.) but this not by force of the word μαθητεύειν, for still a disciple he may be before he learns, and is therefore obliged to learn, because he hath assumed and undertaken to do so, either personally, or by others's *susception*, by his coming, or being brought to be a disciple.

23. So in the other place Act. 14. 21. μαθητεύσαντες ἱκανοὶ signifies no more then having received, or initiated, i. e. (I suppose) by this rite of baptism, made and baptized many disciples, which though



though it be there set down as a *consequent* of the *Apostles preaching* the Gospel in that City (for otherwise, it were not imaginable, that they should receive any *disciples* there, they must first proclaim *admission* to all that *come*, before any can be expected either to *come*, or be brought to them) yet may it very reasonably be extended to more persons than those that understood their *preaching*, viz. to the *infant children* of their *profelytes*, brought to them by their *parents* and dedicated to *Christ*.

24. Thus *invalid* are his attempts from the *notation* of the word, and by consequence his *inference* from thence (which is set down as his *5<sup>th</sup> proof*) that *thereby it may appear how the Apostles understood the precept of Christ to preach the Gospel to persons and thereby make them disciples*. For although the *practice* of the *Apostles* be indeed the means by which we may discern how they understood *Christs precept* (and those two places cited by Mr. T. from *Mat. 13.* and *Act. 14.* do no way belong to that, they tell us not, whether they received *infants* to *baptisme*, or not) yet I may very well ward my self from any *inconvenience*, which this use of the word *μαθηται* in other places can threaten, it being already vindicated from all necessity that it should be confined to grown men, and not communicated to *infants* also.

25. His *last proof* is by returning to the *first* again, comparing the words in *Matthew* with the *parallel* place in *Mark*, *Whereby*, saith he, a *disciple* and *believer* will appear to be the same, the *disciple* to be baptized in *Mat.* being in *Mark* expressed by the *believer*, which is put before baptism.

26. To this I answer, 1. that that passage in *S. Mark*, *He that believes and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned*, and so on to the end of the Gospel, is (as even now I intimated) added by that *Evangelist*, to the words, as they are set down in *Matthew* and so being an *addition*, cannot be looked on, as exactly *parallel* to the words in *Matthew*, *Go and disciple all nations baptizing them*— And this we also know is ordinary, for one *Evangelist* to set down more fully, what is omitted or more shortly set down in another, and *S. Mark* that in other things was willing to abbreviate *S. Matthew*, doth now visibly enlarge; And so the *comparison* cannot regularly be made betwixt these two *Evangelists* words, something being *abbreviated*

in *Mark* which was more at large in *Matthew*, and something more *concisely* set down in *Matthew*, and more largely in *Mark*. And then what necessity is there, that *Mark* not mentioning *discipling* but *believing*: and *Matthew* mentioning *discipling* but not *believing* the *discipled* and *believers* should be deemed the same.

27. Tis true indeed of *grown* men, none can in reason be admitted *disciples*, which are not also *believers* (the ground of which I have set down in the *Resol.* of the *Quære* p. 199.) but of *infant children* this is not true, for those, though they cannot *come*, may yet be *brought*, and though not upon their own *confession*, yet by the *susception* of others, made capable of the *Churches* charity, and so may be *disciples* without *actual* or *personal* belief.
28. Nay 2<sup>dy</sup> if Mr. T. his argument had power to infer it, twere that which I might safely avouch, that *infants* may be comprehended under the style *discipled*; they that *believe* and are *baptized*; so even now we had it in the *expresse* words of *Christ*, the *little ones* (and *S. Luke* specifies them to be *βρεφία little infants*) that *believe on him*: i. e. just as they are said elsewhere to *come unto him*, when they are as incapable, for want of bodily *strength*, of *personal coming*, as for want of *strength of mind* or *judgement*, for *personal believing*, and yet in respect of others *bringing* them to *Christ* (and so to the *Church* in *baptisme*) they are by *Christ* himself said to do both of these, to *come* in one place, and to *believe* in the other.
29. But then 3<sup>dy</sup>, I willingly acknowledge that the word [*believe*] in *Mark*, belongs peculiarly to the *grown* men and women, who are called by the *preaching* of the *Gospel*, of whom though it be said, that *believing* and being *baptized* they shall be *saved*, and *not believing* they shall be *damned*, yet it no way follows, that none but such as thus *personally believed*, should be *baptized*, or that being *baptized* they should not be *saved*, but lose all the *benefit* of their *baptisme*.
30. The later part of the words is considerable, *He that believeth not shall be damned*, *Infidelity* is pitcht on, as the thing peculiarly that incurs the certain *damnation*, i. e. the *voluntary* resisting the *Faith*, when it is *preacht* convincingly to them, and of that none are capable, but those that are arrived to years of *understanding*. Which as it is an indication that that *ver.* and those that follow

follow in *S. Mark* of *believers casting out devils*, &c. v. 17, 18. belong to *adults* peculiarly, so it no way hinders but *S. Matthews* words being different from them, and supposed to be precedent to them in *Christs* delivery, may comprehend *infants* also, as such who are capable of *entring* into *discipleship*, and of being brought and presented to the *Apostles* by *believing* parents, This being the way whereby the *faith* of the *parents* may be signally beneficial to the *childe*, in bringing him thus early into the *School*, and so to the *benediction* of *Christ*, the *parents* together with the *infant* children, as among the *Jews* so among *Christians*, entering together into covenant with *God*.

31. In this matter *Mr. T.* is willing to finde a difference betwix *Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever Christ hath commanded them*, *Mat. 28. 20.* and the *preaching of the Gospel* in *S. Mark*: thinking by that means to avoid the importunity of that text in *Matthew*, which evidently sets *baptisme* before *instructing*. But this can avail him nothing, For if by the *Gospel* in *Mark* we understand the *whole Gospel*, as in reason we must, for that is it which must be *preacht* to every creature (the *Gentile* world) then is that directly all one with *teaching them to observe whatsoever he hath commanded*; But if by *preaching the Gospel* we mean no more then, as *Mr. T.* here saith, that *Jesus is the Christ*, i. e. the proposing him as a *Master*, and calling all to come to him as *disciples*, then this being supposed precedent to mens *coming to discipleship*, or *bringing their infants* to it (for without this they cannot be expected to come themselves, or to *bring their infants*) all the rest is left to follow *baptisme*, and so all particular *Christian instruction* is *subsequent*, not precedent to *baptisme*, an effect of their *discipleship*, attending it, no way necessary to *prepare* for it, which is the utmost *any* *Jesus* *desires*, which from that circumstance of that text I undertook to demonstrate.

## Sect. 3.

*Discipleship before instruction. What knowledge of the Master is required to discipleship. Two sorts of disciples, Some come, others are brought.*

1. **H**IS reasons for the disproving of my interpretation of *Mat. 8.* being thus evidenced to have no force or validity in them against our pretensions, and so indeed his whole *fabrick* demolished, (that place of *S. Mat.* being the one main (if not only) ground of *Antipadobaptists* structure) I might well spare the advantages of the 26, 27, 28. §§. to which he makes some kinde of answer in the remainder of his 25 Chapter: But there is so little weight in his *answers* that they will be speedily dispatched.
2. First then to my 26 S. he saith, that were it all granted me, yet it would no whit avail to prove that an infant may be a disciple appointed by Christ to be baptized. To this I reply, that the 26 S. being most of it spent for the explaining an hard place 1 *Per. 3. 21.* concerning *baptisme*, and for assigning the due notion to *exequium*, a question, or addresse as to an Oracle, for instruction for the future life, I pretended not to conclude infant *baptisme* from thence, nor any more then this, that *baptisme* being the entring of a disciple, and not prerequiring actual instruction, but consisting in coming to Christ and his Church to receive it for the future, 'tis certain that by this account children are capable of *baptisme*, because they may by the care of their parents be thus brought early to Christ, and entred into his school by them, before they themselves have faculties either to desire, or know what is done to them, the proportion holding in this betwixt infants and other scholars that are entred by their parents in any school before they know one letter in the book, or have actual willingness to acquire any knowledge; And this is there illustrated by the example of *Philip, Joh. 1. 44.* and of the *Jews, Ex. 19. 8.* which have again been mentioned, and are clear evidences,

ces, that those may be received into *discipleship* which have not yet had precedent instruction.

3. Against this all that he hath to pretend is set down by him in these words, *Let putting to school be as early as the Doctor will imagine, yet none is put to school till he doth know his teacher, and so none is Christ's disciple in the Scripture language till he know Jesus to be Christ, and take him for his Lord, which infants being not capable of, they are not disciples, nor to be baptized according to Christ's appointment.*
4. To this I answer, 1. That the example which I had used of children being brought to School by the care of their parents, was designed to shew no more then this; that they may be delivered up to be scholars, who as yet know nothing of what they are to learn, nor have actual willingness to acquire knowledge, and consequently that entrance into *discipleship* referres onely to subsequent, supposes not any precedent instruction.
5. And this is competently evidenced by that example, though it were supposed of the child that goes to school, that he knows his teacher, this bare knowledge of the person of his teacher, being none of the documents which he comes to school to learn, but the good letters that are profest and taught in the school, nor indeed is it imaginable why a blind child which is brought to school, or put to an instructor, and so cannot be deemed to know the Master before assuetude hath acquainted him with him, should not yet be said, with as full propriety of speech, to come to school, as he that useth his own eyes as well as feet to direct him thither.
6. 2<sup>dy</sup>. It is as true, that children that are brought to School do not always know their Masters before their entrance, no not by the most superficial knowledge; Many are brought to publick Schools, who never so much as saw their Masters, till they are by their parents delivered up into their power and discipline; If this be not plain enough, then change the similitude from the Schoolmaster to the parent or guardian, or the very nurse, every one of these are to feed and nourish, and, as he shall be capable, to instruct the child, and so doth Christ in a Spiritual sense, whosoever is intrusted (by being brought) to him in baptism. And we know God and Nature doth thus bring a child to the parent, to

the nurse or Guardian, when the child knows none of these, nor understands any more of all these transactions, then the infant doth at the font conceive what is done to it there. And so still this evidenceth the vanity of this answer concerning the child's knowing his teacher.

7. But then 3<sup>dy</sup>. This so imperfect superficial knowledge of the teacher is in no wise worth considering in this matter; For I shall demand, doth such very imperfect knowledge of Christ, as a Schoolboy hath of his teacher, the first hour he comes into the School, qualifye him for discipleship to Christ, or no? If it do, then his countrymen and kinsmen, before he revealed himself to be the Messiah, and the Pharisees, which believed not his miracles, were sufficiently qualified, and then tis evident that those might be admitted to discipleship, which were not believers, and so all Mr. T. his hypotheses are destroyed, and then infants may be disciplined and baptized, though they be not believers.
8. As for that which he here interposes [*the knowing Jesus to be Christ, and taking him for his Lord*] this bears no proportion with the child's bare knowing of his master, but is farre above it, equal to his making it his own choice to have this Master, rather then any other, and promising exact obedience to him, which is much more then is to be found in most young scholars, or indeed in any that are brought by their parents or guardians, who alone are the persons who bear proportion with the infants brought by others to baptism.
9. So that this reasoning of his is soon salved by distinguishing of disciples, that they are either such as come, or such as are brought to School, profelytes of their own choice, or children under the care of others, of the former sort there are none but such as have some rude imperfect knowledge of Christ, upon which they make this choice, and without it would not probably be expected to make it; But for children which as minors in their guardians hands, have no will of their own, there is no necessity they should have knowledge to move their will, they may very reasonably be acted by the will of others, and by their charity be made partakers of those privileges which are communicated from Christ, in his Church to all true members thereof, and to that end be disciplined and, baptized, entred by this ceremony into the Church

*Church of God, where instruction is to be had, as soon as they are capable of it, and in the mean while partake of those other advantages, of which their condition is capable.*

Sect. 4.

*The difference of a disciple and proselyte examined. Christian as well as Jewish proselytes, Priviledges of proselytisme. Disciples of the Pharisees. The Holy Ghost's not using the word proselyte of Christians, concludes nothing. Jehovah. 'Ouson. Infants qualified for baptisme. As for entering into Covenant Deut. 29. Gods oath. Infants adjoined, Creples capable of Christ's cures.*

1. **T**O my 27. and 28. §§. his answer is brief; that *what I say is not right*; And for proof, though he begins with a [For 1.] and so by his forme of *branching*, promises *more* reasons then one, yet that *first* hath never a [Secondly] to follow or back it, and so tis all resolved into that one, viz. that *it is not true that a disciple and a proselyte are perfectly all one.*

2. To this therefore I must advett, and consider what nice difference he can spring betwixt a *disciple* and a *proselyte*, whereupon to found *satisfaction* for conscience why *infants* may be *proselytes*, and as such, come unto *Christ*, and yet cannot be made *disciples*, or received in *baptisme* to *discipleship*.

3. And his reason is, because a *proselyte*, saith he, notes one that is *by birth* an alien from the *Commonwealth* of *Israel*, and comes to the *Israelites* to own their God, and be part of their policie, and not to be taught, but enjoy *priviledges* with other *Jewes*, whether *Civil* or *Ecclesiastical*.

4. But certainly this is no reason of difference, for besides that I, in that §. 27. acknowledged this *accidental* difference, that a *proselyte* denotes a coming from some other nation (as a *disciple* doth not) adding that this difference had no place in this matter, where the *disciples* are specified to be received from all nations; besides this, I say, it cannot be unknowna to Mr. T. that I speak of *proselytes*



*profelytes* in such a notion as is equally competible to all of what nation soever they are, that enter into Covenant with God.

5. Thus do we find a *profelyte* defined, *Heb. 11. 6.* by ὁ προσελθὼν τῷ θεῷ, *he that cometh to God*, thus doth a *Jew* when he enters into Covenant of obedience to him, and thus did a *Gentile* when he undertook the whole law of the *Jewes*, and was therefore גר ברית and גר צדקה a *profelyte* of their covenant, and a *profelyte* of their righteousness, and such is every one whether *Jew* or *Gentile*, that cometh to *Christ*; and as the two former of these were made partakers of *priviledges* by this means, particularly allowed freely to enter into the congregation, and infants as well as grown men, were thus among them admitted into Covenant; so it is not imaginable why it should not hold of the *Christian profelytes* also, nor why the *Christian infants* thus received into Covenant by *Christ*, after the same manner as *Jewish* and *Gentile Infants* were among the ancient people of God, i. e. by *baptisme*, should not as properly be called *profelytes* of *Christ*, though they neither come from any other nation, nor ever associate the selves with *Israelites* according to the flesh.

6. And whereas he saith of the *profelytes* coming to the *Israelites*, that they came not to be taught, but to enjoy *priviledges*, I cannot divine what motive he had to affirme it, for sure the *infant child* that was baptized, and so received into the congregation of *Israel* did come to learn the *Jewish religion*, into which he was thus early initiated, and that was one speciall *priviledge* (the rest of the *heathen* having not knowledge of these lawes,) the immediate end of his *profelytisme*, yet not excluding those other ends of injoying all other *priviledges* both *Civil* and *Ecclesiastical* thereby.

7. And when he addes, but a *disciple* of *Christ* is one that ownes *Christ* for his teacher and Lord only for *spiritual* benefits, I might well acknowledge it, and aske, why then an *infant*, who hath need of those *spiritual* benefits, as soon as he is born, should not be hastened to a participation of them? But it is farther evident, that *spiritual* benefits being first and principally designed, other even *secular advantages* may very lawfully be respected, and reaped by them that are thus early brought in, whether as *disciples* or *profelytes* to *Christ*.

8. Two sage observations he here addeth, 1. That there is no mention

mention of the disciples of the priests, but of the Pharisees and Sadduces, and I can very well grant it, who speak not of any lower kinde of disciples, but either of God among the Jews, or of Christ, among us Christians, those being the only discipleships, to which they were admitted by the ceremony of baptisme, the disciples of the Pharisees and Sadduces being but a subdivision, and notification of several sects among Jews, as there are different denominations of Christians (the more the pity) which divide unity, but use not new baptismes, to discriminate them, I am sure contradict the Apostle if they doe.

9. His 2<sup>d</sup> observation is, that the holy Ghost doth not at any time call Christians Christs profelytes, but his disciples, that, saith he, we might not confound the notions of these terms; But I answer, 1. that those texts that expresse the Christians entering into discipleship, by coming unto him (of which there are good store) do in effect call them profelytes, for a profelyte is a Greek noun derived immediately from the verb *ἔρχομαι* to come unto.
10. And 2<sup>d</sup> that if this word, whether in it self, or in the verb from whence it comes, had never been used in the New Testament, yet would it not thence follow, that we might not confound the notions of profelytes and disciples: The word *Jehovah* is never used by the Holy Ghost in the New Testament, yet may we not thence conclude, that the notion of *Jehovah* and God are divers: *Ὁμοιωσις*, the known style of the Nicene Fathers, is never found used by the writers of the Bible, yet sure it no way follows thence, that the notion of that word, and of this phrase [I and my Father are one] are different and may not be confounded. 'Tis pity to lose time on such fictions of scruple, and difficulty as these.
11. What now is further said by him in this chapter, both concerning little ones coming unto Christ, and of their entering into covenant, Deut. 29. 10. is on both sides but a bare denial of that which is competently proved in that 28 §. For tis there evident that infant children are and always were accounted capable of profelytisme and so of being entred disciples, and particularly of being entred into covenant with God, and so of being baptized, and there is no reason imaginable, why the infants which were capable of coming to Christ, were blessed by him, were affirmed by him to be qualified for the kingdome of heaven, should be

be denyed water to be baptized: The *holy Ghost* being fallen on the *Gentiles* that came with *Cornelius*, *Peter* durst not deny them *baptisme*; And with what equity can the *Christian Church* do it to those, who are qualified for the receiving pardon of *sin*, for being blest by *Christ*, for being received into *Covenant* with him, and may afterward be instructed in all things which are needful to be learnt, For that still they are unqualified, till by bearing they own *Christ* as their *Master*, this is a begging of the question, without any the least tender of proof.

12. As for entering into covenant, when by the force of *Deut. 29. 10.* he is forced to yield it compeitible to *infants*, yet he will do his best to escape the conviction which it offers him, 1. by modifying the sense, then by invalidating my inference from it.

13. First, though he yield that they may enter into Covenant, yet this, saith he, but in some sense, by their fathers all ingaging them under a curse or oath to own God as theirs, in which sense the posterity then unborn did enter into covenant; *Deut. 29. 15.*

14. But if we examine the place, it will be most clear, 1. that the Covenant is entered into by the *infants*, just as by the rest of them, the wives and the strangers or proselytes: On their part, *Ye stand this day all of you before the Lord, that thou shouldst enter into Covenant with the Lord*; and on Gods part, *that he may establish thee this day for a people.*

15. 2<sup>dy</sup> Here is in the text no mention of any act of the fathers ingaging them under a curse or oath, but only of Gods oath which he maketh to them. *v. 12.*

16. 3<sup>dy</sup> If they had thus adjured, or laid oath or curse upon their children, yet would this make no difference betwixt their and our entering into Covenant; we by the oath of baptism which is laid on the child (by him to be performed when he comes to ability, unless he will forfeit all the benefits of his baptism) do in like manner adjure our infants, though whilest they remain such, they hear it as little as the Jewish infants did.

17. 4<sup>thly</sup> Whereas from *v. 15.* he cites that the posterity then unborn shew entered into Covenant, there is no such word in the text, no mention of [posterity] or of [unborn] but of them only, who were not that day with them, i. e. (I suppose) were at that time of assembling absent from the Congregation. I wonder why  
Mr.

Mr. T. should attempt thus to *impose* upon the reader.

18. As for our *inference* (which is this, that by *parity* of reason, *infants* may be entred into *discipleship*, and accordingly *baptized*, as well as they then might be entred into the *covenant* of God) he simply rejects it, without any farther notice of his *reason* again, save onely this, that in *baptisme* such a *discipleship* is *injoyn'd* as is by *preaching* the *Gospel*, and they onely are *disciples* that are *believers*, and the onely are appointed to be *baptized*, who in their own persons do enter into *Covenant* and *engage* themselves to be *Christs* followers, and this is again but a pitifull *petitio principii*, a denying our *conclusion* when the *premises* cannot be denied, and so invincibly inferre the *conclusion*, viz. that those may be brought to and received into *discipleship*, *covenant*, *baptisme*, which in their own persons are not yet able to come to *Christ*, as those *Criples* may be born by others to *Christ*, who wanted strength to *addresse* themselves, and be as really partakers of his *healing* miracles, as those who came to him on their *own legges*. And so much also for the 25<sup>th</sup> Chapter.

## CHAP. III.

## Of the Apostolical practice in this matter.

## SECT. I.

The interpretation of 1 Cor. 7. 12. vindicated. "Αγα. Sanctification used to denote baptism, the use of it in the Fathers and Scripture. Tertullian's testimonie: designati Sanctificatio. Origen. Author Quast: ad Antiochum. Cyprian. Chrysostome. Τίτω there, infant children. "Αγιοι in the Epistles. S. Augustines words examined.

1. IN his last Chapter he proceeds to the view of those §§. which set down the positive part of our basis, evidencing the opinion and sense, which the Apostles had of Christ's institution, and of his intention to include, and not to exclude infants from baptism.
2. The Apostles sense must be judged by their own usage and practice, and that is testified to us two waies, 1. by one considerable remain and indication of it in S. Paul, 2. By the practice of the first and purest ages of the Church, receiving infants to baptism, and so testifying the Apostolical usage, and farther affirming that they received it by tradition from the Apostles.
3. The remain, and indication in S. Paul is in the known place of 1 Cor. 7. 12. where speaking of the believers children he saith v. 14. οὗν δὲ ἁγία ἐστὶ, but now are they holy, i. e. it is the present practice of the Church (that Apostolical Church in S. Paul's time) to admit to baptism the infant children of parents, of whom one is Christian. though not of others.
4. That this is the meaning of [holy] is there made evident, as by other arguments, so by this, that the ancient Fathers who knew the sacred dialect, call baptism Sanctification, *Enm qui natus est,*

est, baptizandum & sanctificandum, in Cyprian, and ἀναδίσσας ἀναδίσσας to be sanctified when they have no feeling of it, and ἐκ βεβήτων ἀναδίσσας, let him be sanctified from the infancy, i. e. baptized then, in Gregorie Nazianzen.

5. To which testimonies, and the rest which is there produced out of the agreement of the Jewish style (קדושים sanctifications for baptismes, to which agrees Macarius's saying of the Jewish baptisme, Κάρα ἀναζου, it sanctifies the flesh, Hom. 47. p. 509.) because the main difficulty of the interpretation consists herein, I shall now adde more, one very ancient before any of these (within less than an 100. years after the death of S. John) Tertullian's *de Anima*, c. 39. where speaking of infants, and saying, ex sanctificato alterutro sexu sanctos procreari, that when either the father or mother is sanctified (i. e. received as a believer by baptisme into the Church, the children are holy &c. (clear evidences of the notion of the word) this he there proves by these very words of this Apostle, *Ceterum, inquit, immundi nascuntur, esse* (to ceterum in Tertullian's style is known to be put for aliqui or the Greek ἄλλοι) *were your children unclean, adding in stead of these other words [but now are they holy] quasi designatos tamen sanctitatis & per hoc etiam salutis, intelligi volens fidelium filios, heretly willing that we should understand that the children of believers are the designed, or the sealed of holyness (in the sense, I conceive, wherein they that are baptized are by the ancients frequently said σφραγισθέντες to be sealed) and thereby of salvation also: And all this, saith he, thus urged by the Apostle, ut hujus spei pignora matrimonii qua retinenda censuerat, patrocinaerentur, that this hope might be a pledge to ingage the believing wife or husband not to part from the unbeliever, And he yet farther addes (still to the confirming of this interpretation) Alioqui meminerat Dominica definitionis, Nisi quis nascatur ex aqua & spiritu, non introibit in regnum Dei, i. e. non erit Sanctus. Otherwise (or if this argument of the Apostle had not been sufficient) he would have mentioned the definition of Christ, that unless one be born of water and the Spirit (i. e. baptized) he shall not enter into the kingdom of God, i. e. shall not be holy, shewing still of what holyness he understands the Apostles speech, that which the child of the believer is made partaker of by baptisme, concluding, Ita omnis anima usque*

eo in Adam censetur donec in Christo recenseatur, tamdiu immunda quamdiu recenseatur. Every soul is so long enrolled in Adam till it be enrolled anew in Christ, and is so long unclean till it be thus anew enrolled, which as it supposes every child of Adam to be impure, till he be thus by baptism made a child of Gods, a member of Christ, so it gives a full account of that uncleanness, and that holyness of which the Apostle speaks, the former the state of a child of Adam unbaptized, the later of him that by baptism is initiated and matriculated into Christ.

6. And to this agrees perfectly that of Origen (of the same age, a very few years after Tertullian) speaking of the Apostles (from whom, saith he, the Church received by tradition that infants should be baptized) Sciebant enim illi quibus mysteriorum secreta commissa sunt divinorum, quia essens in omnibus genuina sordes peccati, qua per aquam & spiritum ablui deberent, They so whom the secrets of the divine mysteries or Sacraments were committed, knew that there are in all the connatural pollutions of sin, which ought to be washed away by water and the spirit, giving us to understand what uncleanness and holyness it is, that children are capable of, the uncleanness of their birth from Adam, and the cleanness or sanctity of Christian baptism.

- \* Tom. 2.  
P. 377. D.
7. So Athanasius \* *Quest. ad Antioc.* 114. (or whosoever it is under the name of that ancient Father) where the salvation of the baptized infants is concluded by him upon force of those two texts, Suffer little children to come unto me; and, now are your children holy, whereto he there sets parallel, *νῦν ἡμεῖς βαπτισθέντες ὅλην ἡμῶν* the baptized infants of believers, as the plain paraphrase of the Apostles words.

- \* Ep. 59. Edit.  
Fam. p. 80.
8. To these I farther adde another passage of \* Cyprian, together with the 66. Bishops that were in Council with him in their Epistle to Fidus, where speaking of the baptism of infants and expressly forbidding that any such should be hindered or kept from it, he brings for proof of it the words of S. Peter, that the Lord had said unto him that he should count none common or unclean, where it appears what was that Holy Fathers notion of common or unclean, such as might be refused baptism, and consequently they which are not such, but on the contrary *ἅγιοι* clean or holy (and such saith Paul here are the *believers children*) are to be admitted thither.

Upon



9. Upon which words of S. Cyprian \* S. Augustine speaking <sup>Ep. 23. ad</sup> saith, he made *no new decree, but kept most firme the faith of the Church, & mox natum rite baptizari posse cum suis coepiscopis censuit, and he and his fellow Bishops resolved that a child might duely be baptized as soon as born.* <sup>Hieron.</sup>
10. So \* S. Chrysostome in his *Κατήχησις* to them that were to be baptized, speaking of the severall titles of *baptisme*, applies unto it that of the Apostle 1 Cor. 6. 11. *ἀλλ' ἀπελούσθητε, ἀλλ' ἁγιασθητε, but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified:* \* and again, of those that were baptized, *ὁ λόγος ὁ ἁγιάζων μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ διζῶν καὶ ἁγίος γινόμενος ἀπέδειξεν, the Scripture pronounces them not onely made clean but just and holy also.* <sup>Edit. Savil. Tom. 6. p. 854. l. 16. Ibid. l. 19.</sup>
11. So \* Gregorie Nyssene in like manner, *Glaphyr: in Exod. l. 2.* \* <sup>Tom. 1. p. 273.</sup> speaking of him that deferres *baptisme* to old age, saith, *ἀνιδεύει μὲν &c. he is sanctified indeed, i. e. baptized, but brings in no profit to God.* And \* Comm: in *Is. l. 1. Or. 1.* speaking of *baptisme* again, and the sufficiency to *wash away sin*, he addes *χρῆμας διὰ τῆς ἀμξ ἀγιασθῆναις— But they are once sanctified, i. e. baptized— But I need no more such like suffrages.* <sup>Tom. 2. 18. C.</sup>
12. This I have both there (55. 34, 35, 36, 37.) and here thus largely deduced, because in this one matter all the *difficulty* consists, and if it be once granted that this is the meaning of [*Now are your children holy*] then here is an evidence undenyable of the *Apostles practice of baptizing infants*, and consequently an *irrefragable testimonie* of their sense of *Christs institution*, including, not excluding *infants*.
13. And so this is a short and clear way of preventing all Mr. T. his indeavours and pains (so largely taken) to invalidate my conclusion from this place of the *Apostle*, and I need not now be farther solicitous for my *paraphrase* on all those 3. verses, wherein he would fain find out some *excesses* and *defects*, some *insertions* and *omissions*: If such there were (as I doubt not to evidence there are none) it would be little for his advantage, as long as the interpretation of the *Last words* [*but now are they* (i. e. *your children*) *holy*] appears to be this, [*but now are your infant children partakers of the priviledge of baptisme*] for this one part of that verse concludes all that I *pretend*, or he *oppugneth*: And this I hope:

hope is now cleared to be no *singular* interpretation of mine, but that which (beside the *ῥαλογικὸν* the *rational* importance of the Context concluding it) the *style* of *Scripture* and the *uniforme* attestation of the *antientest* writers assign to it, so that there can be no reason for doubting in it.

14. Yet because this is one of the *exuberancies* objected to my *paraphrase* (and the onely one which I can without *impertinence* take notice of) that the term [young children of Christians—] is *more then is in the text, which hath onely [your children] which* faith he, *is not restrained to infancie*, I shall briefly remove this exception, 1. By the *authority* of *Tertullian* just now produced, who interpreted it of their *infant children*, as appeared both by the express words [sanctos procreari] and the [ceterum immundi nascerentur] and by the occasion of that discourse in that place, which was the *immunda natiuitas ethnicorum*, the *unclean birth* of *heathens* children, and the unlawfulness of baptizing them, unless one of the parents were *Christian*. To which may be added also *Nazianzens* phrase forementioned, ἀγιασθῶσι ἐκ βρέφους, being *sanctified from infancie* (for so sure βρέφους signifies, ἔμβρυον, ῥήμ, πῦς, a child before or soon after birth, saith *Hefychius*, and *Aristophanes* the *Grammarian* cited by \* *Eustathius*, ὅτι ἐκ νεογόνος a child new born) which in all probability referres to this place of the *Apostle*, and so renders, τέκνον by βρέφους, their children by their *infant children*.

\* In *Iliad*. *Basil.*  
Ed. p. 944.

15. 2<sup>dly</sup>. Tis as manifest by the *general doctrine* of the *Fathers*, when they speak of the *faith* of *parents* profiting their *children*, meaning alwaies their *infant children*, brought to *baptisme* by the *faith* of their *parents*, before they are *personally* capable of having *faith* themselves.
16. 3<sup>dly</sup>. By the *inconueniences* which must follow in case it be interpreted of any other but *infant children*. For supposing them come to years of understanding, and capacity, they shall then either be supposed to have received the *faith* or to remain in *infidelity*: If they have *receiv'd* the *faith* & then be *baptiz'd*, tis evident that this *benefit* comes not to them upon any consideration of the *faith* of the *parent*, but upon their own *personal* profession, and consequently that these cannot be spoken of by the *Apostle* in that place, where he makes the *sanctification* or *baptisme* of the *children*

children a benefit of the *believing* parents cohabiting with the *unbeliever*, and as *Tertullian* saith, *patrocinium*, a plea to move the *believer* not to depart. But if they have lived to years and not received the *faith*, tis then certain that they may not be *baptized* at all; And so tis manifest it must be understood of the *infant* (un-*capable*) children, and none else.

17. Tis true that Mr. T. also excepteth against the *paraphrasing* of [*holy*] by [*admitted to baptism*] affirming this to be a *sense* of the word, no where else found. But this I hope I have cleared already, both from the usage of the word among the *Jewish* and first *Christian* writers, and might farther do it even by this *Apostles* dialect, who in his *inscriptions* of most of his *Epistles* to the *Churches*, calls all those to whom he writes, i. e. the *baptized Christians* of those *Churches*, *ἁγιοι* *holy*, *Rom.* 1. 17. and *ἡγιασμένοι* *sanctified*, and *ἁγιοι* *holy*, *1 Cor.* 1. 2. and again *ἁγιοι* *holy*, *2 Cor.* 1. 1. and *Eph.* 1. 1. *Phil.* 1. 1. *Col.* 1. 1. among whom no doubt there were many who were no otherwise *holy* or *sanctified*, then as all *baptized Christians* are capable of that style. But I shall need adde no more of that to what hath been already so largely said.
18. And the *parts* of my interpretation being thus cleared, that *their children* were their *babes* or *infants*, and their being *holy* ] their being *baptized*, tis sure I cannot be concerned in his *conclusion*, that he never read or heard any *exposition* *antient* or *modern* so expounding as this *Doctor* or *Dictator* doth, nor do I think he can shew any ] I hope now he will alter his mind, and acknowledge that it was his *own* fault, that this interpretation seemed so new and strange to him.
19. As for the one place of *S. Augustine* produced by him (it should be, 1. 2. *de Pecc. Mer. & remis.* c. 26.) to the seeming prejudice of this interpretation, *Ac per hoc & illa sanctificatio cuiuscunque modi sit quam in filiis fidelium esse dixit Apostolus, ad istam de baptismo & peccati origine vel remissione questionem omnino non pertinet* ] it will easily be reconciled to it, if we but mark what *question* it is; that there he speaks of, even that which he had then in hand; *viz.* whether *baptisme* were necessary to *remission* of *sinnes*, and *entring* the *kingdome* of *heaven*.

20. That this was the *question* in hand appeareth by the words immediately *precedent*, which are these, *sanctificatio Catechumeni si non fuerit baptizatus, non ei valet ad intrandum regnum celorum aut ad peccatorum remissionem*, The sanctification of a Catechumenus (what that is he had mentioned before, Catechumenos secundum quendam modum suum per signum Christi & orationem impositionis manuum puto sanctificari, that some kind of sanctification which the unbaptized might have by prayer and imposition of hands, of which we sometimes read in the *antients*, as hath elsewhere been shewed) profits him not for the entering the kingdome of heaven, or obtaining remission of sins, unless he be baptized. And therefore that sanctification of whatsoever kind it is, viz. if it be without baptism, belongs not, saith he, to the *question* then in hand concerning baptism and the original and pardon of sin.
21. Here then I suppose is Saint *Augustines* meaning. The adversaries with whom he disputes (the *Pelagians*) to maintain the no necessity of baptizing infants for the remission of sinnes, made use of that *text*, and concluded from it the sanctitie of the *Christian infant birth*, before, and without baptism: To this he answers, without any strict examination of the importance of that *text*, that whatsoever sanctification it can be imagined to be, that the *Apostle* speaks of, except it be that of baptism, it cannot avail to the remission of sinnes, &c. Some improper kind of sanctification, saith he, he may confesse, secundum quendam modum, in him that is not yet baptized, but that without baptism non valet ad intrandum, is not of force for entering into the kingdome of heaven, and therefore whatsoever sanctification that is (viz. whatsoever without baptism) it belongs not to his *question* then before him, and so the *Apostles* words can have no force against him.
22. This I suppose then to be in brief S. *Augustines* meaning in that place, that tis not the holiness of the *Christian infants birth*, but of their baptism, which stands them in stead toward the kingdome of heaven: And then that, as it is no evidence on my side, that he interpreted that place to the *Cor.* as I interpret it, so it affirms nothing to the contrary, but leaves it in medio, having his advantages other wayes against the *disputers*.

23. However for the substance, his accord with us is evident and his conclusion firme both in that place, and l. 3. *de Pecc. mer. & Remiss. c. 12. Illud sine dubitatione tenendum, quacunque illa sanctificatio sit, non valere ad Christianos faciendos, atque addimittenda peccata, nisi Christiana atque Ecclesiastica institutione & Sacramentis efficiantur fideles.* It is to be held without doubting, that whatsoever that sanctification be, it avails not to the making them Christians and to the obtaining remission of sins, unlesse by Christian and Ecclesiastical institution, and by the Sacraments they be made faithfull.
24. This is all that I can seasonably return for the vindicating of my paraphrase, It would be too immoderate an excursion to take notice of all his pretended objections to the former part of it, which concerns the cohabiting of the believer with the unbeliever, which I assure Mr. T. were easy fully to answer, and shew his mistakes in each particular, if the matter of our present dispute did require, or would well bear a *περίοδος* of that length, or if I thought it in the least degree usefull to the reader, that I should farther explain the grounds of my paraphrase, then as they are already laid before him, Sect. 31. &c.
25. Yet because the reasons which I there rendred for the paraphrase taken from the notations of the word *ἡγιασμένος*, [has been sanctified] and *ἐν γυναικὶ* (not so, but) by the wife] and by the plain consequences, what knowest thou o wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband — are by Mr. T. examined with an endeavour to confute them, and so to overthrow the whole paraphrase, it may perhaps be thought usefull that I should take a view of those his endeavors, and therefore that I shall now proceed to do, and shall there meet with by the way what was most material in his former exceptions against my paraphrase.

## Sect. 2.

*The rendring. ἡγιασται [hath been sanctified] defended. S. Hieromes testimonie. Enallages must not be made use of without necessity. No advantage from it here. Feigned instances of Enallage. Κλωμενον, ἀγαπαῖν δεῖ, δεδωται. Κήρυται.*

1. First then, to my first evidence taken from the word ἡγιασται, [*hath been sanctified*] referring to some past known examples and experiences, of this kind (of a wives converting the husband &c.) he hath a double answer, 1. That as my paraphrase expresseth it, it should signifie not onely that an unbelieving husband hath been sanctified, but also that there is hope they will, and so it should note not only some example past, but also some to come, of which there can be a lesse reasonable account given then of putting it in the present tense in English. 2. That the Enallage or change of tense is frequent, c. 11. 14. Κλωμενον in the present tense for the future, and here ἀγαπαῖν δεῖ for ὠσ or εἶν, and in the next verse δεδωται in the preter for the present, and so ἡγιασται here, *not; hath been, but is sanctified, or if in the preter tense, yet that to be understood of a past thing yet continued, as κήρυται Joh. 3. 18. notes an act still continued in force.*
2. To these two I reply briefly, and first to the former (the same which he had mentioned before, and excepted against as an excessse in my paraphrase. but both there and here without the least cause;) For in my paraphrase, I look upon ἡγιασται as a verbe of the preter tense, and as such onely adapt the sense to it, referring it not to future hopes but to past experiences or examples; Onely because examples are rhetorical syllogismes, and what hath been frequently experimented may also reasonably be hoped, I suppose that the Apostle so meant these examples, as grounds of hoping the like for the future, not making this of the future any part of the sense of ἡγιασται in the preter, but explicating the τὸ λογικὸν or rational importance (which is somewhat more then the τὸ ἐντὶς) of the Apostles speech, and supposing this conclusion to ly hid under this premisse,

as

as it is ordinary in all discourse to set down the *premisses* distinctly, leaving the *conclusion* by every ones reason to be *drawn* from thence, without setting it down *explicitely*.

3. Wherein that I was not mistaken, I had all assurance from v. 16. where the argument is prest, and the *conclusion* inferred more *explicitly*, For what knowest thou, o wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband — and the like mentioned in the *Paraphrase* from 1 Pet. 3. 1.

4. And herein I have the authority of S. Hierome; as for my rendering *by you* by the woman (so I find it, *per mulierem*, in his 7<sup>th</sup> Epist. ad Latam, and so Marianus Victorius in his Scholia assures us, all the Copies antient and printed, read it) so also for this part of my *Paraphrase*; *exemplum refert* (saith he on the place) *quia saepe contigerit ut lucriferet vir per mulierem*, Unde & Beatus Petrus ait, ut si quis non credideret verbo, per mulierum conversationem sine verbo lucriferent, id est, cum viderint eas in melius commutatas, cognoscant omnes Dei legem ita consuetudine inveterata potuisse mutari. He producert an example because, saith he, it hath often happened that the husband hath been gained by the wife; according to that of S. Peter, that if any man believe not the word; he should without the word be gained by the conversation of the wife, that is, that when they shall see them changed to the better, all may know that the Law of God might have been taken in exchange for so inveterate a custome.

5. And so again Ep. 7. ad Latam, speaking of the like example, Bene, saith he, feliciterque expectavimus; Sancta & fidelis domus virum sanctificat infidelem, we have well and happily expected (i. e. not mist of our expectation) an holy and faithfull house sanctifies an unbeliever; adding his conceipt, ipsum Jovem, si habuisset talem cognationem, potuisset in Christum credere; that Jupiter himself if he had had such a kindred, might have been brought to the faith of Christ.

As for his 2<sup>d</sup> answer, I acknowledge such *Enallages* to be ordinary in the Hebrew, and sometimes, but more rarely found in the Hebraizing Greek, or Hellenists; and consequently that where the context will not bear the sense of the sense which is used, there may be place for this *Grammatical figure*, which yet is not to be made use of *unnecessarily*.



7. Accordingly, if there were any *convincing* reason offered, that *iniquus* in the *preter tense* could not be born, I should not then doubt to interpret it by this *figure*, either in the *present* or some other *tense*: But when (as here it is evident) there is no such necessity, then 1. I cannot think fit to do so, (tis dangerous to forsake the *literal sense*, when it may be commodiously retained, and fly to either a *Rhetorical*, or *Grammatical figure*) and having no motive to do so, I am next to consider, what is the *properest* importance of that *phrase* in that *tense* wherein it is used, and then I could not (I believe) have fallen upon any thing more *natural*, then that the *preter forme* of speech referred to the *past experiences*, &c.
8. This is a full *satisfaction* to his answer, yet I may in the 2<sup>d</sup> place *ex abundanti* adde thus much more, that the utmost that he can pretend to by the *enallage* (whether of the *preter* for the *present*, or of the *preter* understood of a *past* thing yet *continued*) is as commodious for my *interpretation*, as the *preter* is: For if it be in the *present*, then the importance will be, that it is a matter of *present daily experience*; if in the *past continued*, then that it is matter both of *past* and *present experience* that the *unbeliever* is thus wrought upon by the *believer*, and brought into the Church by *baptisme*, and this a just ground of *hope*, that so it may be again in any particular instance, and so a *competent motive* that the *believing wife* should abide with the *infidel husband*, and not depart as long as he will live *peaceably* with her, and this sure was S. Hieromes understanding in the words newly cited, *exemplum refert, quia saepe contigeris* &c. the *Apostle* makes instance, *producat exemplum*, that this hath (and doth) *ordinarily come to passe*; And to that also exactly agrees the 16<sup>th</sup> verse, *For how knowest thou* &c.
9. As for Mr. T. his instances of *Enallage*, though now I may safely yield them all, and rather *gain* then *lose* by them, I shall yet in the last place adde my sense, that no one of them is any way *convincing*; that of *καλῶς* is not, c. 15. 24. for his *passion* was now so near *approaching*, that it might very truly be represented as *present*, and so that be the force of the *present tense*.
10. That of *αὐτῶν* is not *pertinent*, for certainly [*is*, *is*] is not for [*was*, *was*] which is the *enallage* of *tenses*, nor is there any

any necessity it should be for [ἐν] (the *enallage of modes*) the rendring is proper, *else are your children unclean, and exactly all one with else were*, the change of the *mode* not changing the *sense* in this matter; which was the cause why I followed the *English* rendring, and made no change in that translation.

11. As for his 3<sup>d</sup> instance διδάσκει v. 15. which he saith is manifestly put in the preter tense for the present, I cannot be convinced of it, The context will well bear the preter tense yet continued [no Law of Christ hath or doth thus *enslave* her] or the preter tense simply [she by entering the bonds of marriage hath not thus *enslaved* her self] that she should think her self bound to do any thing contrarie to her religion in order to continuing with her husband.
12. As for κέκτηται, Joh. 3. 18. I wonder it could be thought fit to be produced to the prejudice of the preter tense, when the [ἤδη, *already*] which is present, is an evident proof of the preter tense, and if it be continued as well as past (he that hath been condemned remaining still under condemnation) this is still perfectly agreeable to my notion of ἠύχασαι, the unbeliever *ōt* hath been, and daily is converted, and brought to baptisme by the believer.
13. And so much for all the grounds of his first exception, and his two answers to my inference from [ἠύχασαι.]

### Sect. 3.

The rendring ἐν γυναικὶ by the woman] defended, ἐν for ἐν. Κνηρὺν ἐν γυναικὶ Col. 1. 23. Κνηρὺς. Διδάσκων ἐν ἀνθρώποις Act. 4. Irenæus no Latine author, ἐν πατρίων Act. 7. Gal. 1. 16. 1 Per. 1. 5. ἐν οὐ Dent. 28. Ἐλαβες θύματα ἐν ἀνθρώποις, Psal. 68. My proof of the interpretation from the context.

1. THE 2<sup>d</sup> concernes the rendring of ἐν γυναικὶ, which I read; [by the woman] but he [to the woman] as [to] is a note of the dative case, and so is redundant.
2. And the reason, saith he, that he still adheres to his way, is, because this seems to him the fairest, easiest, and most congruous sense

sense thus to expound it, *The believer may abide with the unbelieving yoke-fellow, For though he be an unbeliever, and in himself un sanctified, yet in or to his wife he is as if he were sanctified, it's all one in respect of conjugal use, as if he were sanctified.*

3. To this reason I have many things to answer, 1. That the very rendering it, is the begging the question, which is onely this (in this matter) whether this be the fairest, easiest, and most congruous sense, and must not be here supposed, when it should be proved.
4. 2<sup>dly</sup>. That if it were the fairest sense, yet if the words bear it not, it must not be affixt to them, if it be more capable of another; and whether they will bear it or no, is the question again, on occasion of which this inquiry is made into the use of the preposition *ἐν* and to suppose again that it will signifie [so] in the dative sense, before it is proved it will, is a second begging the question, a paralogisme in stead of a reason.
5. 3<sup>dly</sup>. The fairenesse of the sense (simply taken) is not attempted to be proved, which yet doth stand in great need of it; For beside the redundance, or unusual sense of *ἐν*, some other parts of the rendering are none of the fairest, As 1. *the believer may abide*] as if it were simply free to abide or not abide, whereas in the present case (when the unbeliever is willing to abide with the believer) the believer is by the Apostle counselled at least, if not commanded (and that is more then a liberty, that he may) To him the Apostle saith (and his sayings have sure authority with them) *μὴ ἀφίηκας αὐτόν, ἵνα μὴ ῥυτίσῃς τὸ πρόσωπόν σου* let him not put away. Nay the interdict of Christ belonging to all, but that one case of fornication, Mat. 5. and Mat. 19. it is evident that by force thereof the believing man must not put away the unbeliever, that is guilty of no more but unbelief; And accordingly the preface, *Τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς* — But for the rest (or, for the other questions, v. 1. 6. 8. 10.) say I, not the Lord] must be applied not to the immediate consequence, of the believers not putting away the unbeliever, that will stay with him (for that had been determined by Christ in the Negative) but to v. 15. If the unbelieving depart, i. e. if the unbeliever will not dwell with the believer, except the believer forsake his, or her religion, what shall be done then? And to that the Apostles counsel is, that marriage in slaves not the believer so far.

6. All which is a competent prejudice to that part of Mr. T. his sense, *The believer may abide*, For if that be it, even when the *unbeliever* is willing to *abide*, then she *may* also *depart*, if she rather choose, which will be found *contrary* to *Christ's* precept, and so may not be admitted.
7. <sup>2<sup>dy</sup></sup>. In this rendering, *ἡγιασμένος* is *englished* (not by *is* or *hath been sanctified*, but) by [*is as if he were sanctified*] which indeed acknowledgeth that he is *not* truly (in any respect) *sanctified*, and then sure this will be a strange *construction*, ὁ ἀπιστῶν ἡγιασθήναι the *unbeliever* (is not *sanctified* but) *is as if he were sanctified*, when yet *literally* it must be rendred the *unbeliever hath been*, or (to gratifie Mr. T.) *is* or *continues to be sanctified*: For what is this but to interpret an *affirmative* by interposing a *negation*, he *is sanctified*, by *he is not*? for so assuredly he is not, if he onely be *as if he were*.

With this let any man compare the interpretation I have given, the *unbeliever hath been sanctified by the believer*, i. e. *examples* there are of such as have been thus *converted* from their *unbelief*, and this sense enforced by the *interrogation*, v. 16. *For what knowest thou, ὦ ἄνθρωπε, whether thou shalt save the man* &c. and by S. Peters *aphorisme* of daily observation, 1 Pet. 3. 1. the *husband that obeys not the word*, i. e. the *unbeliever*, may probably be gained by the *conversation* of the *wife*, and then let him impartially *pass judgement*, which is the *fairest* and *easiest* rendering.

8. His <sup>2<sup>d</sup></sup> reason is, because though the Dr. deny it, yet (saith he) *I averre*, that the notion of *ἐν* for *to*, as a sign of the *dative case*, is found more then once in the *New Testament*.
9. The truth of this I must now examine by the *proofs* offered for the *affirmation*. And his first proofe, is from *Mat. 17. 12.* ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, *This*, saith he, *cannot be eluded*, because the same speech is *Mar. 9. 13.* ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου and rendred by *Bez. a* in the former place, *fecerunt ei*, they did to him, 2. Whereas the Doctor saith *ἐν* is used for *eis*, upon him or against him, It had been meet the Doctor should have given one instance at least of such *construction*, which, saith he, I do not believe he can do.
10. To this I answer, 1. By two ready instances in one verse, *Lu. 23. 31.* Εἰς τὸ τῷ ὕμνῳ ἑὺλαο πάντα ποῦόντων, ἐν τῷ ξυρῷ τῇ γίνεσθαι; If they do these things (our ordinary English reads in a green tree,

but the sense and propriety directs us to) on the green tree, what shall be done on the dry? here is the very phrase that is used in that place of *Matthew*, *μὴν ἐν ὕψει*, as *ἐμὴν* (as *ἐν αὐτῷ*), and then for *S. Markes* using (in the parallel place) *αὐτῷ* for *ἐν αὐτῷ*] that proves not that *ἐν* was redundant in *S. Matthew*, or that it was a bare sign of the dative case, it being free to *S. Marke* to use any other expression, different from *S. Matthew*, so he retained the sense, as it is clear in this place he doth, doing injuries to him, being all one in effect with upon or against him, though the phrases are not the same, which no way inferres that when the change of the phrase changes the sense, it were lawfull so to varie it, as in the place we have in hand (*ἐν γυναικί*) 'tis on both sides supposed to do.

11. A 2<sup>d</sup> instance which he conceives cannot be eluded, is *Col. 1. 23.* *ὅτι κηρύχθη ἐν πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει*, which was preached to every creature, and this he proves to be the only rendering. 1. Because *κηρύσσω* to preach, is commonly with a dative case of the object, and though, *1 Tim. 3. 16.* it is *ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἑθνεσιν*, yet our translators, and the vulgar, and Beza read it unto the Gentiles, as if there is noted only a dative case, and if it were among the Gentiles, there, yet here *Col. 1. 23.* it cannot be so, because the object is in the singular number, but *ἐν*, when it is for among, is joyned still with a noun of the plural: and 2. That which, saith he, puts this out of all doubt, is, that the phrase *Col. 1.* answers *Mar. 15. 16.* *κηρύξατο τὸ δαγγέλιον πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει*.

12. But to all this the answer is ready, by observing the exact notation of *πᾶσα κτίσις* the whole creation (as we render it *Rom. 8. 22.*) as that signifies the whole, but especially the Gentile world, and accordingly is express'd by *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη Mat. 28.* and farther explained by *ἐλθὲ κόσμῳ* the whole world, to which in *S. Mark* they are appointed to go, when they were thus to preach the Gospel *πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει*, to this whole creation. Now of *κτίσις* in this notion it is clear, that though it be in the singular number, yet that hath the power of the plural, as the word [world] and the like, which every body knowes, is a noun of Multitude, and so is creation, when it is thus taken for the whole created world, meaning this world of men, the nations or people of the world.

13. And then there can be no doubt but *κηρύχθη ἐν πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει*]

*Alleg]* is most exactly thus to be rendred, *preached in, or among the whole creation, as Gal. 1. 16. ἀγγέλλω ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, preach in the nations, or among the Gentiles, and so 1 Tim. 3. 16. also, though the sense being no way altered by rendring it unto the whole creation, or every creature, and to the Gentiles, it matters little though it be promiscuously thus rendred in all these places, which yet must not prescribe for other places, where the sense is so much changed by the divers rendring, as in this case ἡγίζον ἐν γυναικί] is observable, where therefore the literal rendring being retained, we are not reasonably to conclude any more from it, then that literal rendring will afford us. As for the parallel phrase Mar. 16. that doubters can prove nothing, 1. Because the places are not, nor can be thought parallel, 2. Because if they were, (as of Mat. 28. and Mar. 16. hath been granted) yet the parallel lying onely in the sense, and that being all one, whether they *preach to or among the Gentiles*, this no way concludes that the phrases are the same, or the *ἐν* in one redundant, which is the onely thing for the proving of which this parallel is produced, but of that I have formerly spoken.*

14. His third instance is διδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις, Act. 4. 12. which he cannot yet conceive, but that it is better rendred, *to men, then among men*. And his reasons are, 1. Because διδομι hath most regularly and consequently a dative case of the person after it. 2. Because if it had been among men, it had been to be placed after ἑτέρων, other, there is no other name among men, given, but being placed after given, it is to be expounded as referred to given, not to other, and so must be read, *to men, not, among men*. 3. It seems no good sense, nor true, that Christ was a name given among men, for though he were among men, yet he was given from above. To all which he adds the judgement of Irenæus, l. 3, c. 12. cited by Beza, and a parallel phrase ἐν πατρί for πατρί, Act. 7. 44.
15. To these I answer, 1. That tis true that when διδομι hath any case of the person following and governed by it, that is constantly the dative, but that is no way applicable to this phrase διδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις, for there the persons, ἀνθρώποις are governed by the preposition ἐν, not by διδομένον.
16. To the 2<sup>d</sup>. That the construction by among, is very good, placing it after given, there is no other name given among men, i.e.

no means of *salvation* afforded by *God*, and continued *among men*.

17. To the 3<sup>d</sup>. That *Christ's* being *given from above*, no way pre-judges his being *given among men*, both because the *benefit* of this gift is as a common *donative*, distributed *among men*, and also because this *gift* is dispensed in forme of *humane flesh*, *Christ* is become *man*, and to be found and seen *among men*.
18. And to the last, for the place of *Irenaeus*, tis strange that neither *Mr. T.* nor *Beza* whom he transcribed, should remember that *Irenaeus* wrote *Greek*, and that as the *Latine translation* [ *datum hominibus* ] is not written by *Irenaeus*, so there is no question but *Irenaeus's Greek* was the same with the text in the *Acts*, *δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις*, and then the *Translator* (barbarous enough through that whole book) is to be reformed by the *Author*, and not the *Author* judged of by the *Translator*; Or if he were, and *Irenaeus's Greek* did really read *ἀνθρώποις*, without [ *ἐν* ] as the *Translator* doth [ *hominibus* ] without [ *in* ] then I must resolve, that the copie of the *Scripture*, which he followed, did so read before him [ *δεδομένον ἀνθρώποις* ] and if so, then what proof can *Mr. T.* have from thence that in other places or *phrases*, where *ἐν* is found in all copies, it shall be *redundant*, and signifie no more then if it were not to be found there?
19. As for *ἐν πατρίσιν*, it must certainly be rendred, *among the Fathers*, thus, the *tabernacle of witness* was *among our Fathers in the wilderness*: Tis pity the reader should be exercised and detained with such debates as these, with which yet in obedience to *Mr. T.* I must farther importune him.
20. For a 4<sup>th</sup> instance he again resumes that of *Gal. 1. 16.* and *2 Per. 1. 5.* That *Gal. 1.* where of *God* the *Apostle* saith, that he was pleased to reveal his own sonne *ἐν ἑμοί*, and when I had rendred that by, *or through me*, to others, This exposition, saith he, makes the *Apostle* tautologize ineptly.
21. This strange undecent expression I wish had been spared, for certainly there was little temptation for it: why, I pray, might not the *Apostle* without incurring either part of that *censure*, say, *God was pleased through me to reveal his sonne*, and by way of explication, (and withall to denote the designation of that *Apostle* to his peculiar province, as the *Apostle* of the *uncircumcision*) adde, *that I might preach the Gospel to the Gentiles*. Certainly every



every explication of an *obscurer* or narrower, by a *clearer* or larger phrase, is not *inept tautologic*, but that which all writers which have desired to speak intelligibly, have always been full of.

22. And yet 2<sup>d</sup> the *latter* part here, of his *preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles* (he being peculiarly the *Apostle* of the *Gentiles*, as *Peter* and *John* were of the *Jewes* wheresoever dispersed) is more then was pretended to be said by my rendring and paraphrasing the former part of it; for in that those others had not been defined, who they were, or limited to the *Gentiles*.
23. This Mr T. adverted not in his *objection*, I desire he will now take notice of it. For that of *ἐμχορηγῆσαι ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν ἀρετὴν*, I need adde no more to what I had before said, that it is most fully rendred thus, *unto or over and above your faith superadde virtue, or fortitude*.
24. Two places, he saith, he had formerly produced out of the old Testament, *Dent. 28. 60.* and *2 Kin. 7. 27.* and now addes one more, *Psal. 68. 18.* But besides that three onely places in the whole old Testament, would never inferre that so it must be in this place of the *new*, there being many more to preponderate for the contrary, and there being no pretense of necessity that thus it must be here, besides this, I say, it will be found, that these three will be of no *availle* to him.
25. Of the two former the 2<sup>d</sup> is not, there be but 20. *vers.* in that Chapter, and therefore no *iv* in the 27<sup>th</sup>: and for the former we well read it, *unto thee*, where the 72. reads *iv* *Co*, in the ordinary way of acception of *iv* for *eis*.
26. And lastly, for his new sprung *testimonie*, *Psal. 68. 18.* of *ἑλὰς δῶματα ἐν ἀνδράποισ*, for which saith he the *Apostle* hath *Eph. 4. 8:* *ἔδωκε δῶματα τοῖς ἀνδράποισ*, which he takes to be more then enough to refute the *Doctor*, tis presently visible that it hath no manner of force in it; For though those two places are perfectly parallel, as to the matter, yet for the expression tis evidently very different, in one [*thou hast received*] in the other [*he hath given*] and so [*ἐν ἀνδράποισ* for or among men] must of all necessity differ from [*ἀνδράποισ* to men] For how could it be sense to say, *thou hast received gifts to men*? yet so it must be, to make good Mr. T. his observation, that *iv* signifies *to*, or is redundant, or the note of a *dativ* case.

17. And so he never had a more improper season for his *triumphs*; never lesse cause to tell others of *talking ad random*, when he himself was so far removed from all appearance of *demonstration*. And so much for the *Grammatical* notation of *ἡ γυναικί*, very unfit to have exercised us thus long, but that Mr. T. would have it so, and words are the meanes of conveighing *realities* unto us, and mistakes in them (though minute) may be of *substantiall* importance.
18. My 3<sup>d</sup> proof produced for my *interpretation* of the first part of v. 14. which to me put it out of all doubt, by comparing it with the *reason* subjoynd, *For what knowest thou, o wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband; or how knowest thou, o man, whether thou shalt save thy wife?*] he comes next to examine, and hath many *exceptions* against it, all which (without losing time in repeating and viewing them severally) will be soon dispelled by a right understanding of the force of the *Apostles* argument as there I conceive it to ly, Thus v. 14. *It is matter of ordinary observation, that unbelieving husbands have been brought to the faith and baptisme by the believing wife, therefore I now exhort and counsel the believer not to depart from the unbeliever, in case the unbeliever be willing to stay, v. 13. for this reason, v. 16. because what hath been so oft, may very probably be hoped again, and consequently upon the premises the believer hath ground to hope, that she may in time gain the husband to the faith, and that, being so fair a reward in her view (the saving or rescuing him from infidelitie, to Christ) may well inforce the counsel of the Apostle, not to depart from him, as long as, without sin, she is permitted to stay.*
19. By which it appeares that this v. 16. is not a bare *explanation* of *ἡ γυναικί* v. 14. (on which Mr. T. his exceptions principally depend) but an *application* of the argument formerly proposed, but now more signally brought home to them, under the forme of [*τι γὰρ ὅτι* for what—] by this means to reinforce his *conclusion* of their not departing for the cause of *infidelitie*: If the reader will but observe what is thus visible, he will want no more help, to get out of the *intricacies*, and toiles, which Mr. T. hath here spread for him in this matter, which is in it self so manifest, as nothing can be added to it, if either the *text* or my *paraphrase* may be permitted to speak for it self.

Sect. 4.

*Mr. T. his mistake of my sense. The argument à genere ad speciem. Ἀνδρα and ἀντα. How the husband is said to be baptized by the wife. Ἰσχυ partial washings. The proportion betwixt legal holyness, and baptisme. Difference between relative and real sanctification. The testimonies of the antient, for and against my interpretation.*

1. **H**IS exceptions to the former part of my paraphrase being now ended, I must attend what he hath to say against the latter part of it, that which concerns our matter in hand more neerly; The words are *ἐν ᾧ ἀπα*, for else were your children unclean, but now are they holy, i. e. upon that score it is that Christians children are admitted to baptisme, viz. because by their living in the familie with the Christian parent they probably will (and ought to) be brought up in the faith—and the Church (requiring and receiving promise from the parents) reasonably presumes they will, and so admits them to baptisme.
2. This argument of the Apostles thus explained in my paraphrase (or if he yet will have it more plainly thus, *The Church upon confidence that the believers children will be brought up in the faith, receives them to baptisme when they are infants; And upon the same grounds of hope, that your abiding with the unbelieving husband may in time convert him (as by experience it hath oft been found) I advise you not to depart from him, if he will live with you; For what knowest thou whether thou shalt save thy husband, &c.*) Mr. T. hath made a shifte not to understand, and substituted another way of arguing in my name, in stead of it, p. 331. And having done so I must leave him to combat with the shadow of his own creating, no part of his impression lighting upon that, which alone I professe to be my meaning in it; which I leave him or the reader to see, in the particulars proposed by him, but must not now be so impertinent, as to lose time in the pursuit of them.
3. But the reasons produced for my thus interpreting, he next proceeds to examine, and I must take care to vindicate them. My first

17. And so he never had a more improper season for his triumphs; never lesse cause to tell others of *talking ad random*, when he himself was so far removed from all appearance of *demonstration*. And so much for the *Grammatical* notation of *ἡ γυναιξ*, very unfit to have exercised us thus long, but that Mr. T. would have it so, and words are the meanes of conveighing realities unto us, and mistakes in them (though minute) may be of *substantiall* importance.
18. My 3<sup>d</sup> proof produced for my interpretation of the first part of v. 14. which to me put it out of all doubt, by comparing it with the reason subjoyned, For what knowest thou, o wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband; or how knowest thou, o man, whether thou shalt save thy wife? he comes next to examine, and hath many exceptions against it, all which (without losing time in repeating and viewing them severally) will be soon dispelled by a right understanding of the force of the Apostles argument as there I conceive it to ly, Thus v. 14. *It is matter of ordinary observation, that unbelieving husbands have been brought to the faith and baptisme by the believing wife, therefore I now exhort and counsel the believer not to depart from the unbeliever, in case the unbeliever be willing to stay*, v. 13. for this reason, v. 16. *because what hath been so oft, may very probably be hoped again, and consequently upon the premises the believer hath ground to hope, that she may in time gain the husband to the faith, and that, being so fair a reward in her view (the saving or rescuing him from infidelitie, to Christ) may well inforce the counsel of the Apostle, not to depart from him, as long as, without sin, she is permitted to stay.*
19. By which it appeares that this v. 16. is not a bare explanation of *ἡ γυναιξ* v. 14. (on which Mr. T. his exceptions principally depend) but an application of the argument formerly proposed, but now more signally brought home to them, under the forme of [*τι γὰρ for what*—] by this means to reinforce his conclusion of their not departing for the cause of *infidelitie*: If the reader will but observe what is thus visible, he will want no more help, to get out of the intricacies, and toiles, which Mr. T. hath here spread for him in this matter, which is in it self so manifest, as nothing can be added to it, if either the text or my paraphrase may be permitted to speak for it self.

Sect. 4.

*Mr. T. his mistake of my sense. The argument à genere ad speciem. Ἀνάδοξα and ἄγια. How the husband is said to be baptized by the wife. Ἰσχυρὸν partial washings. The proportion betwixt legal holyness, and baptisme. Difference between relative and real sanctification. The testimonies of the antient, for and against my interpretation.*

1. **H**IS exceptions to the former part of my paraphrase being now ended, I must attend what he hath to say against the latter part of it, that which concerns our matter in hand more neerly; The words are *ὁμις ἀγα, for else were your children unclean, but now are they holy, i. e. upon that score it is that Christians children are admitted to baptisme, viz. because by their living in the familie with the Christian parent they probably will (and ought to) be brought up in the faith— and the Church (requiring and receiving promise from the parents) reasonably presumes they will, and to admits them to baptisme.*
2. This argument of the Apostles thus explained in my paraphrase (or if he yet will have it more plainly thus, *The Church upon confidence that the believers children will be brought up in the faith, receives them to baptisme when they are infants; And upon the same grounds of hope, that your abiding with the unbelieving husband may in time convert him (as by experience it hath oft been found) I advise you not to depart from him, if he will live with you; For what knowest thou whether thou shalt save thy husband, &c.*) Mr. T. hath made a shift not to understand, and substituted another way of arguing in my name, in stead of it, p. 331. And having done so I must leave him to combat with the shadow of his own creating, no part of his impression lighting upon that, which alone I profess to be my meaning in it; which I leave him or the reader to see, in the particulars proposed by him, but must not now be so impertinent, as to lose time in the pursuit of them.
3. But the reasons produced for my thus interpreting, he next proceeds to examine, and I must take care to vindicate them. My first

- first reason is, because *ἅγια*, *holy*, noting a relative holynesse, a setting apart to God, and the lowest degree of that imaginable being the initiating into the Church by baptisme, this must in reason be here noted by *ἅγια* *holy*, as all visible professors, *Ezr. 9. 2.* are the *holy seed*, and in the *Epistles* of the *Apostles*, *ἅγιοι* *holy*.
4. To this he answers, that it being all granted, confirms not the Doctors exposition, because tis no good argument *à genere ad speciem affirmativè*, and because infants are not visible professors.
5. But sure when the species is such, that he that hath not that, hath not any part of the genus, the argument will thus hold very irrefragably: Suppose that of the Deacon to be the lowest order of officers of the Church, and that without which there is no ascending to any higher degree in the ministerie, will not then the argument hold; He hath some degree Ecclesiastical upon him, therefore sure he is a Deacon? Thus sure it is in this matter, the relative holynesse belongs to no person, that is not baptized, baptisme is the lowest degree of it, and all superior degrees of Apostle, Prophet, &c. in the Christian Church are founded in that, therefore if the infant children be holy, the infant children are baptized. So again, Baptisme is the lowest degree of visible profession, therefore if these that are said to be holy, are visible professors, then sure they are baptized; And so there is no force in that whether answer or exception to my first reason.
6. My 2<sup>d</sup> follows from the notation of *ἀκαθάρτα*, *Act. 10. 14.* for those that must not be received into the Church, as on the other side God's cleansing is God's riputing him fit to be partaker of this priviledge, whereby it appears how fitly, receiving and not receiving to baptisme] are exprest by [holy and unclean.]
7. To this he answers by acknowledging the conclusion, viz. the fitnessse of the expression, All his exception is against my premise, the notion of unclean, *Act. 10. which*, saith he, signifies there not onely one out of the Church, but also one that a few might not go in to, or eat with. To this I reply, that my conclusion being granted, I may safely part with that, which inferred it, as when I am arrived at my journeys end, I have no farther need, or use of my horse or guide that brought me thither: Let it be remembered, that [holy and unclean] fitly expresse those that are received, or not received to baptisme, and then I am sure I have

nor

not offended against the *propriety* of the words, by concluding from this *text*, that in the *Apostles* time the *believers* children were received to *baptisme*; And if I have as little offended against the *rational* importance of the words in that place (as I hope hath formerly appeared that I have) then I hope I am perfectly *innocent* in inducing my *conclusion*.

7. As for the use of the *phrase* *Act. 10.* though now I need not contend, yet I may adde, that the notion of *not entering to, and eating with*, containing under it this other of *not baptizing* (for sure he might not baptize those to whom he might not enter) and the *baptizing Cornelius* (and not onely *entering* to him) being the end for which *Peter* received that *vision*, I still adhere that *αὐθαγῆ* in that places signifies one peculiarly that must not be received into the Church by *baptisme*; and the *holyness*, on the contrary, reception to that *privilege*.

8. My 3<sup>d</sup> reason being taken from the use of the *Hebrew* *קִדְּשׁ* to *sanctifie*, for *washing* any part of the body, and on occasion of that, mentioning a conjecture that the use of *holyness* for *baptisme* might perhaps intimate that the *primitive baptisme* were not always *immersions*, but that *sprinkling* of some part might be sufficient; he hath a reply to each of these; To the former, that if *this reason* were good, then the *husbands* being *sanctified by the wife*, must signify *his* being *baptized or washed by her*; to the latter, that I have in my writings so oft acknowledged the *baptisme* of the *Jewes and Christians* to be *immersion* of the whole body, that I ought to be ashamed to say the contrary, and that I can hardly believe my self in it.

9. To these I answer, first to the former, 1. That I that affirm *sanctifications* among the *Jewes* to signify *washings*, do also know that it hath other significations, and that that signification is in each *text* to be chosen, which seems most agreeable in all those respects which are to be considerable in the pitching on any interpretation; Consequently that the *wife's baptizing the husband* being a thing *absurd*, and utterly unheard of in the Church of God, whether in the *Apostles* or succeeding ages, this sense may not reasonably be affixt to it, whereas the *baptizing of infants* by the *antients* affirmed to be received from the *Apostles*, it is most reasonable to understand the words of *this*, though not of the



other (and so to apply the *observation* (as it is visible I did) to the latter, not former part of that *verse*.

10. And yet 2. if we shall distinguish of the notion of [by] and expound [*ἐν γυναικὶ* by the woman] of the *persuasion*, that the woman hath used to bring her husband to baptism, and not of her mystic in baptizing, we may very conveniently so interpret the former part of the *verse* also, that by the woman, *ὁ ἀπίστος ἄνθρωπος* the unbelieving husband hath been brought to baptism, viz. by being brought to faith, to which this privilege belongs.

11. As for his 2<sup>d</sup> exceptions to my conjecture, founded in the use of קדשו *sanctifications* for partial not total washings, 1. I answer, that I mention it only as a conjecture, with a perhaps, and lay no more weight upon it: 2. That for *Christian baptism* I no where affirm that it was only by immersion, nor on the other side that it was always by sprinkling, but disjunctively, either by one or the other (as by the words cited by him from *Prac. Cat.* 1. 6. Sect. 2. is clear) supposing indeed that *Christ's* appointment was not terminated to either, and so satisfied by either.

12. My last reason is taken from the effect of the legal uncleanness, contrary to those their *sanctifications*, viz. removing men from the congregation; agreeable to which it is that those should be called holy, who in the account of God, stood so, that they might be received into the Church; To this he answers, that it is said without proof that the uncleanness excluding from, and sanctification restoring to the tabernacle are proportionable to the notion here given of the childrens being excluded or included in the Church, asking, why Cornelius should be counted out of the Church, being a devout man.

13. But to this I reply, that that which is so manifest needed no farther proof, for what two things can be more proportionable, or answerable the one to the other, then the *Jews* calling those unclean, and holy, who were excluded from, and restored to the tabernacle, and the *Christians* calling them unclean, and holy, that were excluded from, and received into the Church, the exclusion and reception being the same on both sides, as also the uncleanness and holiness, and the proportion lying only betwixt the Jewish tabernacle and the Christian Church, which surely are very fit parallels as could have been thought on.

14. As for his *question* of *Cornelius*, it is most vain, the whole discourse being not of *real* but *relative* sanctification, and the difference most visible betwixt that *sanctity* which was *truly* in him in respect of his *devotion, fearing, praying* &c. and that *outward* privilege of *admission* into the *congregation* of the *Jewes*, which alone was the thing which in the account of *God*, or *sober* men was denied *Cornelius*.
15. These be pitifull *sophismes*, and in no reason farther to be insisted on, And therefore it was *necessary* that to *amuse* the reader, he should here adde by way of *close* that *Augustine* did *disclaim* this interpretation, *Hierome* and *Ambrose* gave another, and so did *Tertullian De Anima*, c. 39.
16. The three former of these we must, it seems, take upon his word, for he cites not the places where they give that *other interpretation*, nor pretends he that they gave that to which he *adheres*: But for *Tertullian* the most ancient of these, by the place here cited, I am assured what *credit* is due to his *citations*, having set down the words at large from that c. 39. *de Animâ* and found it perfectly to accord to my *interpretation*:
17. The like hath appeared of *S. Hierome* in part (for the former and more *difficult* part of the *verse*) *the man hath been sanctified, exemplum refert*, saith he, *quia saepe contigerit*, just according to my *paraphrase* of the place.
18. For *S. Augustine* also, l. 2. *de Pecc. Mer. & Remiss.* c. 26. (which I suppose the place he means) I have already accounted. And for the *Annotations* on the *Epistles*, which go under *S. Ambrose's* name, as I have not commoditie to examine them, so they are *known* and universally acknowledged to be none of *S. Ambrose's* writings; And then it is competently evident how little he hath gained by this unseasonable appeal to *testimonies*.
19. The designe, I suppose, was to *prevent* the force of my *allegations*, For in that place as an *appendix* to the use of the word, *holy*, among the *Jewes*, I had added the *acception* of it among the *ancient Christian* writers, *S. Cyprian*, *Ep. 59. Eun qui natus est baptizandum, & sanctificandum*, and the two places out of *Gregory Nazianzen*, of *ἀγασθῆναι ἀγαθῶν*, being *sanctified* when they are *not* (through want of years) *sensible* of it, and

ἐκ βεβίου ἀγιασθῆναι, sanctified from infancy. And before he chooses to take notice of these, he brings forth his names of *Fathers* too; with what success, we have seen, and shall not need farther to consider.

20. At length he descends to take notice of my *testimonies*, and to them he hath two answers, 1. That for the *antients* of the *third* or *fourth* Century, especially for the *Latine* Doctors, he thinks the Doctor knows them better than to assert that they knew certainly the sacred Dialect, adding that few of them had skill in Hebrew or Greek. 2. That if those Fathers knew the sacred dialect, then not holy but sanctified, must be as much as baptized, and then the sense is, that the unbelieving husband is baptized by the wife.
21. This latter answer was even now satisfied to the full, To the former then I reply, 1. That of the two *antients* cited by me, the former was crowned a *Martyr* within 160 yeers after the *Apostles* age, and the latter flourished about 110 yeers after him, and so that in respect of their *time* they are no way incompetent to testify what was the sacred language, the writers whereof were so lately gone out of the world.
22. 2<sup>dly</sup>. That one of these being a *Greek* Doctor, and he agreeing exactly with the other (and more of the same kind I have now produced in this *Rejoinder*) there can here be no pretense for Mr. T. either to prejudice the *Latine* Doctors skill in this matter, or to say they had no skill in *Greek*.
23. 3<sup>dly</sup>. That the notion that they had of the word, being the very same, that the *Hebrews* were so lately shown to have had of it, there was as little colour, or temptation from the matter in hand, to except against their skill in *Hebrew*.
24. 4<sup>thly</sup>. That either of these *antient* Doctors knew as much (the one much more) of *Greek* as any of the four whom just now Mr. T. had vouched for the interpreting of the place; and for the *Hebrew* S. *Hierome*; who alone was better skilled in that, concurred with me in the main part (and basis) of my interpretation.
25. Lastly, The text to the *Corinthians* being in *Greek*, certainly *Gregory Nazianzen* was as great a *Master* in that language, as any that can be pretended fit to be confronted against him,

him, and with that concurrence, which I have shewed he had of *O-*  
*rigen*, and others, both *Greek* and *Latine*, may be thought worthy  
to be heeded by Mr. *T.* for a matter of no greater *weight* then his,  
the *interpretation* of a word, especially when Mr. *T.* himself hath  
so lately joyned his *suffrage* in these plain words, *I deny not the* p. 333.  
*fitness of the expressing* [*receiving to baptisme*] *by the terme*  
[*holy.*]

And so much for those *exceptions* against the *latter* part of my  
*paraphrase* of that *verse*, and my *reasons* for it.

## CHAP. IV.

*An answer to Mr. Tombes's view of my Conclusion  
and therein the sense of Antiquity in this Question.*

## SECT. I.

*Tέτρα, 1 Cor. 7. infant children. The Jewes practice. Their notion of [ holy ] Baptisme a priviledge of believers children, yet is communicated to others whose guardians are believers. The severall sorts of holyness all vainly mentioned by Mr. T. His denyals of the Conclusion. The place in Tertullian vindicated. S. Hieromes answer to Paulinus. Institutionis disciplina in Tertullian. Candidati Damoniorum. A 3<sup>d</sup> denyal of the Conclusion. The use of baptisme to regenerate &c. No prejudice to the founding it in the Jewish practice. His art of diversion to put off answering of testimonies. The way of Testimonies insisted on.*

1. **A**FTER this examination of my paraphrase of this text to the *Corinthians*, he proceeds to the conclusion which I deduce from thence, which is no other then my premisses, viz. my confirmation of that interpretation, had regularly inferred, that the infants of *Christian parents* were by the *Apostles* received to baptisme.

2. But to this he will object also, not onely by referring to his former performances in validating the premisses (to which I shall not need to now advert, having refuted his answers, as they were produced) but by denying the consequence in case my interpretation were granted, and that upon these accounts, 1. Because it is not clear that [ your children ] are [ your infants ] the *Corinthians* having ( for ought yet hath been shewed ) other children besides infants, and the Jewes baptizing proselytes, children females  
under

under 12. and males under 13. years old, not according to their will, but of the Father or Court. 2. Because if the Apostle should by [ *holy* ] mean a priviledge whereupon they were baptized he should conceive otherwise then the Jewes did, who conceived all unclean whom they baptized, till by baptisme they cleansed them, and made them holy. 3. Because there is no priviledge attributed by the Apostle to the Christians infants, which would not belong to the infants of heathen, or if there were yet it might not be baptisme.

3. To the first of these I have incidentally answered already, by making it evident, not that the *Corinthians* had no other children beside infants (I have no want of such ridiculous evasions) but that the children which are there spoken of were infant children, as appeared both by the express words of *Tertullian*, and the Author of *Answers ad Antiochum*, and the agreeableness of *Nazianzen's* expressions, by the general doctrine of the *Fathers* in this matter, and by the inconveniences which were consequent to the interpreting it of any other but infant children, meaning by them such as are either strictly infants, new born, or such as are proportionable to these, having not arrived to maturity of understanding, and capacity of professing personally for themselves. For this I must refer the reader to that place.

4. And for the practice of the Jewes, which I acknowledge to be as is here suggested, not to baptize any *profelytes* children by their own wills or professions, till they be, the female at the full age of 12. the male of 13. years, sure it makes nothing against me, for they that thus baptized the *profelytes* children, all under that age, by the profession of others, did also baptize their infant children in the same manner, and all that I pretend from that place is, that the *believers* infants were admitted to baptisme, if infants they were, not doubting but if they were of greater years they were baptized also, if before they were fit to profess for themselves, then by their parents or the Churches, but if fit to answer for themselves, then by their own profession.

5. To the 2<sup>d</sup> I say, that by [ *holy* ] the Apostle means the priviledge of admission to baptisme, because in baptisme they were received into the Church, and so made relatively holy; And the very same was the Jewes notion of holyness, when they called baptismes;

*baptismes, Sanctifications, and conceived those that were unclean to be made holy by that means, This holyness is the terme of the motion in both their usages of the word.*

6. To the 3<sup>d</sup>, 1. I suppose it evident by my *interpretation*, that the *holyness* which belonged to the *believers children* was a *priviledge*, and that not *common* to the *unbelievers children*, unless they were by the charity of the *Church* or some member thereof (having power, and assuming to make use of that power, to bring them up in the *knowledge* of their *baptismal vow*) brought to *baptisme*, and then those supplied the place of the *parents*, and the *children* equally received the same *benefit* by that *charity*, as if their *own* *parents* had done it for them; and there being no reason here offered to the *contrarie*, but a *reference* to another place, which I have not *commodity* to consult or *examine*, there is nothing that exacts any farther reply from me.
7. The same will satisfie the latter part of this last *suggestion*, for to prove that if there were a *priviledge*, yet it might not be *baptisme*, he produceth this reason, that *baptisme* according to the *fathers opinion and practice* belonged to *unbelievers children* also, if they were brought: which being willingly granted, & so the matter cleared, that the *children* of *believers* were to be admitted to *baptisme*, when the very *unbelievers children*, if brought & assumed for by others, which were not their *parents* were to be admitted, It certainly follows not from thence, that the *believers children* were not admitted, or that their *admission* was not a *priviledge* of *believers children*, For so still it was, though by *parity of reason*, and by the *charity* of the *Church* it was *communicated* to some others: viz. those that were brought by *friends* or *guardians*, though not by *parents*, for so still this *priviledge* belonged not to those *unbelievers children*, who lived in their *parents* power, & were not thus undertaken for by *believers*.
8. The short is, *baptisme* was a *priviledge* of the *believers infants* undertaken for by their *parents*, and by *analogie* communicated to those who were undertaken for by others, whose *charitie* and *pietie* supplied the place of *believing parents*, but was not *communicated* simply or *indifferently* to all *children* of *unbelievers*, and herein the *priviledge* consisted.
9. As for the other imagined *priviledge*, which he names, belonging to *infants*, If it be that of *real, actual, inward holyness*, I discern



discern not Mr. *T.* hath any *kindnesse* to it, (nor can he, without destroying his own *hypotheses*) and therefore it matters not what others imagine; If it be federal external *holynesse*, that I suppose to be the same with *baptismal holynesse*, *baptisme* being the entrance into that Covenant, And for *holynesse* in hope and expectation, *i.* that cannot denote *actually holy* (as *Sciv* here notes) unlesse by *holy* we mean in the relative sense, consecration or designation to *holynesse*, and then it is all one with *baptisme* again, the solemnity of that consecration.

10. Before he leaves the survey of my conclusion, he will again resume what he had said without all degree of truth in the beginning, and yet doth it with great incitation, *First*, saith he, *it is false that Christ founded his institution in the Jewish practice.*

11. But this I suppose in Mr. *T.* to be no other then a *mentiris Bellarmine*, or that most *inartificiall* thing, the denying a conclusion which had been inferred by competent premisses. And for the reason added to his negation, that it would utterly overthrow all *baptisme* after the first conversion of progenitors, that hath been largely answered here, and grounds laid for it in the resolution of the *Quare*, by the Jewish practice of baptizing the children of natives, as well as of proselytes, and so of those that are born never so many ages after the first conversion. And I must not again so often repeat the same thing.

12. In the same causelesse fit of incitation, he farther goes on, 2<sup>ov</sup>. saith he, *It is false that there is any evidence in the Apostles words, 1 Cor. 7. 14. of such a Custome of baptizing Christians and their children.* But that I humbly conceive, is the denying my conclusion again, having all this while laboured to clear this evidence in the *tract*, and here vindicated it from all objections, which seemed to have the least force in them: And where-as he here addes no other reason to his negation, but his own not thinking that ever any of the Fathers did interpret the Apostles words as this Doctor doth, adding that *Tertullians words de Anima, c. 39. are not an exact parallel to the Apostles speech* (which I must suppose I have now shewed it is) that *Ambrose and Hierome interpret them of legitimization in birth, Augustine what way soever, not to baptism* (of each of which I have spoken already also) all that I shall need adde, is onely this.

M

1. That

13. 1. That still if this argument were *exactly* true, yet it is but a *negative argument à testimonio*, which never was available in any dispute: 2. That if the *Fathers* do not fully interpret this place as I now do, yet I have brought some *suffrages* and other competent grounds out of the *Fathers* for my way of interpreting it: 3. That what he hath said for the invalidating the *Testimonie* out of *Tertullian*, hath certainly no force in it, as shall now briefly appear by this view of what he saith.
14. It is this, 1. That the termes *candidati sanctitatis*, or *designati sanctitatis*, or *candidati fidei* in Hieroms *Epif.* 153. to *Paulinus*, do note not that they were baptized, but that they were in designation of being believers and baptized, intended to be holy by the parents, to be bred up to the faith and so baptized. 2. That what the Doctor talkes of *Tertullian* as saying they were holy, i.e. baptized, ex *feminis prerogativa*, it is a manifest mistake, for 1. The holynesse he ascribes to believers children was not onely by prerogative of birth but also ex institutionis disciplina by the discipline of their instruction which is afore baptism. 2. The prerogative of birth the very words of *Tertullian* shew to be no more but this, that believers children were born without those idolatrous superstitions which were used in the birth of infidels children, which he there principally recites.
15. To this I answer by degrees, 1. By viewing the place in *S. Hierom*, to which he referres me for the explication of the phrase, *candidati* or *designati sanctitatis*. That *Epistle* to *Paulinus* is hastily written in answer to two questions of *Paulinus* his proposing. To the later, being this, *quomodo sancti sint qui de fidelibus, i. e. baptizatis nascantur* (which plainly referres the matter to these words of the *Apostles*, how the children born of believing parents are holy) he gives a very short solution, being taken off by the hast of the post and the multitude of other letters, he had to write. All that he is permitted to say is this. *De secundo problemate tuo Tertullianus in libris de monogamia disseruit, asserens sanctos dici fidelium filios quod quasi candidati sint fidei, & nullis idololatria sordibus polluantur. Simulque considera quod & vasa sacra in tabernaculo legimus, & caetera quae ad ritum ceremoniarum pertinent, cum usque sancta esse non possint nisi ea quae sentiuntur & venerantur Deum. Idioma igitur Scripturarum est ut interdum sanctos pro mundis & purificatis & expiatis nominent, sicut*

sicut & Beesabee sanctificata dicitur ab immunditia sua, & ipsum templum sanctuarium nominatur. Of your second probleme Tertullian hath discoursed in his Books de monogamia, affirming the children of believers to be called holy, because they were as it were candidates of Faith, and not polluted with any of the filth of idolatrie. We shall consider that also we read that the vessels in the tabernacle are holy, and the other things which belong to the use of ceremonies, when yet nothing can (really) be holy but what have sense, and worship God. It is therefore an idiom of the Scriptures to use the word holy for those that are clean, and purified and expiated, as Bathseba is said to be sanctified from her uncleanness and the temple is called the Sanctuary. And so he is abruptly broken off, meaning to have said much more on that subject, this, as he solemnly protests (*testis est mihi conscientia mea Deus*) being but the *procinctus* & *exordium*, the preparation and beginning of his interpretation.

16. If he had gone on to have perfected his answer to *Paulinus's* quare, he would probably have more perfectly cleared the whole difficulty. As it is, here is nothing in the least wise to our prejudice, nor to the proving that which Mr. T. undertakes, that *Tertullian's* words de *Anima* do not affirme the baptizing of the believers children.
17. For 1. This of *Tertullian* is not the place that *S. Hierome* refers to, but some other in his *Bookes de Monog.* that one Book which we now have under that title affording us no such discourse on that subject, as *S. Hierom* mentions.
18. 2<sup>dy</sup>. All that *S. Hierom* cites out of that (not this) place of *Tertullian*, is very reconcileable with what *Tertullian* saith in this place, and with his opinion that the infants of Christians were baptized, for, saith he, they were *quasi candidati fidei*, as it were candidates of faith. Candidates were they that stood for any office *qui candida sumpra veste consulatum. praturam &c. postulabant*, who putting on white garments sued for any office, and so candidates of faith, they that sue, for this condition in the Church of God, that of *new* believers, to which by baptism they are assumed, and accordingly were to be brought to the font, like such candidates, in white garments as they that were to be sanctified, i. e. baptized, among the Jewes, *Exod. 16. 10.*

were also to wash their cloths or put on clean garments.

19. Again when he saith of them that they were *holy as the vessels of the Temple were holy*, though they had no sense, this is the clear laying of a ground, whereby children may be deemed capable of this *relative holynesse*, which is to be had by *baptisme*, though as yet they are not capable (for want of *understanding*) of *inherent holynesse*.
20. Lastly, when he mentions it as an *idiome of Scripture* to call them *holy*: who are *cleansed, purified, expiated*, speaking of those *legal lustrations or purifications*, this gives an account of *S. Pauls* using the word in the *Christian Church* for the *Christian lustration, purification, expiation*, i. e. for *baptisme*.
21. And by the way, it appears by *S. Hierome* that he useth promiscuously *sancti* and *sanctificati*, and so that gives us authority to interpret [*ἁγιάζει*] in the end of the verse, in the same sense in which [*ἁγιάσαι*] is used in the beginning, for those that are *brought and received to baptisme*. All which are farre enough from serving any of *Mr. T.* his interests, and might have inclined him to have omitted that *testimonie* of *S. Hieromes*, if he had more maturely considered of it.
22. Nay 3. I must adde, that *Mr. T.* his rendring of *candidati* and *designati sanctisatis*, and *candidati fidei*, by being in designation of being believers and baptized, intended to be holy by the parents, to be bred up to the faith and so baptized, is a most groundlesse inconvenient interpretation: For if by *holynesse* and *faith* be meant *inherent holynesse* and *faith*, then *baptisme* it self is the ceremony of consecrating and designing them to this, and so precedent to that *holynesse* (not subsequent to it, as *Mr. T.* sets it) and accordingly in the *Church writings* the word *ἁγιοὶ* believers, is never bestowed on any, though of *mature age* and knowledge, till after they be baptized; *ἁγιοὶ* and *ἁγιοὶ* illuminate and believers being all one, promiscuously used for those that have received *baptisme*, in opposition to *catechumens*, those that have not yet attained it: But if *holynesse* and *faith* be the *relative holynesse*, then *infants* being as capable of that as *vessels in the Temple*, they might be presently designed and consecrated to that, and not first bred up in the faith, before they were partakers of it.

23. The children of believers, I willingly grant, are presumed to be by them intended to be bred up to the faith, but it that intention of theirs bring forth no present effect, if they do not bring them thus early, and enter them into the Church by baptisme, why should that bare intention of the parents give them the style of holy or sanctified, or how should these infant children, which may dy before they come to those years, receive any present priviledge or benefit, by that which is thus farre removed from them?
24. Now for the 2<sup>d</sup> part of this suggestion, that what I say from Tertullian, that they were holy, i. e. baptized in seminis prerogativa, is a mistake, I must answer by viewing of the proofs of his assertion, First, saith he, the holynesse was not onely by prerogative of birth, but ex institutionis disciplina. This sure is a strange proof, It is not so, because it is not onely so, 'Tis certain that Tertullian saith they are holy ex institutionis disciplina, and as certain that they are as much so by prerogative of their birth, the words are most clear, tam ex seminis prerogativa quam ex institutionis disciplina; and I that never denied the second, could not be mistaken in affirming the first.
25. Some difficulty I suppose there may be, what Tertullian (who did not excell in perspicuity of expressions) meant by institutionis disciplina. My opinion (gathered from the observation of his language in other places) is, that he meant the doctrine of baptisme instituted by Christ in his Church; for by this it is that baptisme was allowed to those that were ex alterutro sexu sanctificato procreati, born of parents of which either of them was Christian.
26. Thus in his Book De Bapt. c. 12. he uses a like phrase ringi disciplinâ religionis, to be sprinkled with the discipline of religion, meaning evidently being baptized.
27. By this interpretation of that phrase, the whole place will be most clear, in reference to the antecedents, thus, The birth of all men by nature brings impurity into the world with them; the children of heathens have this mightily inhaled to them by the Superstitions that are used before and at, and soon after their birth, inviting the devil to come and take possession of them (who is himself very ready to catch them) and so making them as soon

as born, *candidatos demoniorum*, candidates of the devils, ambitious to be admitted thus early into their service; Thus every one hath his *geniu*, i. e. his devill assigned him from his birth, and so no birth of any heathen can choose but be polluted, *Hinc enim Apostolus*— for from hence, saith he, it is that the Apostle affirms that whosoever is born from either parent Christian, is holy both by prerogative of seed, and by discipline of institution, i. e. hath one priviledge by nature, by his very seed (by being born of a Christian, not an heathen) that he is not so polluted by their idolatrous ceremonies, and so is in some degree holy, in that respect, not so polluted as heathen children are; another priviledge he hath by the orders and rites, which Christ instituted and left in his Church, viz. that of reception to baptism, whereby he is consecrated to God, whereas heathen children are defecrated to devils, and in that respect also they are called holy by the Apostle, citing that place, *1 Cor. 7. Caterum, inquit, immundi nascerentur, else were your children unclean, but now are they holy*, adding that the Apostle in those words means, that the children of believers are *designati sanctitatis*, that sure must signifie that they are initiated into Christ by the Christian rite or sign or ceremonie of baptism, as those which had the heathenish ceremonies used upon them, were *candidati demoniorum*, candidates of the devils, in the former, thus early admitted and initiated into their *sacra*.

28. How farre now this is from intimating any discipline of their instruction (the word *their* is clearly inserted by Mr. T. and institution rendred instruction, and so Christs institution turn'd into their instruction) I shall not now need farther to declare, nor to adde ought concerning his other reason taken from the idolatrous Superstitions, without which they that are born are said to be holy, for how farre that hath here place, I have already manifested also.
29. In this fit of incitation he yet farther proceeds, 3. Saith he, it is false that the Jewish practice in baptizing profelytes and their children, laid the foundation of infant baptism: But as this is like the former, a meer denying of my conclusion, and so against all rules of discourse, in the first place, so is it not attempted to be proved, save onely by the negative argument à testimonio, Neither the Scripture, saith he, gives any hint thereof, nor any of the  
antient

antient Christian writers, no nor any of those the Doctor cites, ever derives it from the Jewish practice.

30. But certainly this is of no force; for 1. So long as none of all these deny it, to be so derived, and when the matter it self speaks it and the agreement between what we find in the Christian Church with what we find among the Jews, there is no want either of truth or sobriety in my assertion, that Christs institution of baptisme was founded in the Jewish practice of baptizing their natives and their proselytes, and that their custome being to baptize infant children, Christs institution also being by the Apostles understood to belong to the infant childrens baptisme was in that respect also conformable to the Jewish copy, and so still the Jewish practice the foundation of the Christian.

31. What he addes from several antient testimonies, shortly pointed at, that they shew that the Fathers took the baptisme of infants not to have foundation in the Jewish practice, but in the conceit they had that baptisme did regenerate, give grace and save, and was necessary for them to enter into the kingdome — hath nothing of weight in it. For 1. Their conceiting that baptisme had this force from Christs institution, no way prejudices Christs founding his institution in the foregoing Jewish practice.

32. 'Tis as if he should thus argue, the Fathers conceived the Sacrament of the Lords Supper to be usefull for the confirming of our faith, therefore they took that Sacrament not to be founded in the postcenium of the Jews. They conceived imposition of hands to conferre a Character on those that were thus ordained to holy orders, therefore this was not founded in the Jewish custome of receiving Doctors into the Sanhedrim by laying on of hands. The foundation of the institution is one thing, and the benefits of it being instituted is another, and yet both these are found to belong to the same thing.

33. <sup>2<sup>d</sup></sup> Their very opinion that baptisme did regenerate, and was necessary to enter into the kingdome, as it is taken by the Fathers from the words of Christ to Nicodemus Joh. 3. Except a man be born again, v. 3. and that of water — v. 5. (by baptisme) he cannot enter into the kingdome of God, so was that speech of Christ, taken from the customary doctrine of the Jews, among whom baptisme was said to regenerate, and to enter into the Church,



as that was the *portal* to the *kingdome* of *God*, and accordingly when *Nicodemus* seems not to understand it, *Christ* appeals to the *Jewish doctrine* or *tradition*, *Art thou a Ruler, a Master in Israel and knowest not these things?* and therefore again those *persuasions* of the *Fathers* are far from *unreconcilable* with that which I have affirmed of the *founding* the *Christian* in the *Jewish baptisme*.

34. Nay 4. That the *Fathers* in their discourses of *baptisme* do ordinarily lay the *foundation* of it in *Moses* or the *baptisme* of the *Jewes* (and so might as well found the *baptisme* of *Christian infants* there, the *Jewes baptisme*, as hath appeared, belonging to such) hath formerly been evidenced from *Gregorie Nazianzen*, *Orat. 39. Ἐπειδὴ βαπτισμὸς τῶν νηπίων — ἰσθμίου Μωϋσέως —* and so from others also.
35. What he now addes of *womens baptizing* among *Papists* and the *allowance* thereof formerly among us, of *private baptisme*, of the use of *propounding questions* to the *infant* which he is pleased to style *ridiculous*, of the *sureties answering* in the *childs behalf*, and expressing their desire to be *baptized* into the *faith* recited, of the *custome* of *baptizing* onely at *Easter* and *Whitsontide*, of *sprinkling* or *powring* water on the *face*, of a *confession* in the *Pract. Cat.* that all men were instructed *antiently* before they were *baptized*, is all amass together, if it might be, to make up one *accumulative argument*, but is utterly *insufficient* to do so. All that he concludes from the mention of all these, is but his own *resolution* not to answer the *testimonies* which I had alledged from the *Fathers*, to prove that *Infant baptisme* was an *Apostolical tradition*. His words are these, upon the mentioning of those particulars [*And therefore for the present I shall put by the answering of the stale and rotten allegations out of the Fathers for infant baptisme brought by the Doctor, because having said so much.*]
36. Here indeed by his [*therefore*] I am told the *reason* why he was willing to mention those other *particulars* so causelessly and unreasonably, *viz.* by way of *diversion* (as *dextrous* persons are wont to do for the removing of *difficulties*) to put by the *answering* of the *allegations* out of the *Fathers*.
37. But I must not thus farre complie with Mr. T. The main issue of the whole *dispute* must divolve to this, the *doctrine* of the *anti-*

ent Church in this matter, For, 1. *baptisme* being instituted by *Christ* long before his *crucifixion*, and 2. The forme wherein he instituted it being not set down in the *Gospels*, and so 3. The *Apostles practice* being our *only guide* for the resolving such difficulties as these, whether *infants* were *admittable* or no to *baptisme* (the foundation thereof among the *Jewes* visibly belonging to *infants*, but it being still possible that this might be changed in *Christs institution*) it is not now imaginable what way should be open to us of this age (1600 years after those times) to discern *Christs institution* in this matter, but by the words or actions of (or some kind of intimation from) the *Apostles*, how they understood *Christs institution*.

38. Of this one place we have 1 Cor. 7. which comes in incidentally, speaking to another matter, and notifies the *Apostles* sense by their practice visibly enough, and defines for the baptizing of *infants* in those dayes; But to them that will not acknowledge this sense of those words, how fair and easy soever, there is but one possible method remaining in this, as in all other questions of fact (as evidently this is, whether in the *Apostles* times and by their appointment children were received to *baptisme* or no) viz. to appeal to those that could not be ignorant of this matter, who by succession and tradition, the one from the other, had the *Apostles practice*, the interpreter of their sense of *Christs institution*, conveyed and handed down unto them, and are to us, their late posterity, the only competent witnesses of this matter of fact, and so are in all reason to decide the controversy, and give a final conclusion to the debate between us.

39. This therefore being the last part of my method in the positive part of the Resolution of that *Quare*, I professe to have laid the most weight upon it (according to the grounds set down in the first *Quare* concerning the deciding of such controversies) and consequently must still insist upon it, and not be put off by Mr. T. his dexterity, and that in this matter I may not fail of giving the Reader some evidence, I shall again resume it, and give him a competent series of testimonies, some formerly mentioned, and now put more into forme of evidence, and others added to them, so as to inferre an *uniforme concordant tradition* of all the ages of the Church of *Christ* even since the *Apostles* times unto this day, for

the receiving infants to baptism; and that shall be the last part of this *Replie* to Mr. T. and the *Antipædobaptist* whose pretensions are the contrary, that infants must not be thus admitted.

## SECT. 2.

*A Catalogue of Testimonies of the first ages for Infant baptism, and the Apostolicalness thereof.*

1. First then I begin with the words of the *Apostle* so long insisted on, and vindicated from Mr. T. his exceptions, and by so ancient a writer as *Tertullian* &c. applied to this matter.
2. And that first *Epistle* to the *Corinthians* being written at the end of his three years stay in *Asia* *Act.* 20. 31. i. e. *An. Chr.* 54. I shall there place my first testimony.
3. In the middle of the first *Centurie* S. *Paul* delivered these words, *Now are your children holy*, i. e. your children new-born (as appears by the context and *Tertullian*) are sanctified, as that signifies baptized, in the style of the *New Testament* and the ancient Church, ἀγιῶνται ἡ διὰ βαπτισμοῦ ἀγαθῶν they are vouchsafed the good things that come by baptism, saith the Author of the *Respons: ad Orisod.* whether that were *Justine the Martyr*, who suffered *Anno* 163. or another very ancient writer under that name; And this of that *Apostle* is an evidence of the practice of the first, 4. or *Apostolical* age, soon after *Christ*, and is not contradicted by any that wrote in that age.

\* *Ep. Eccl. Smyr.*  
ap. *Euseb.* l. 4.  
c. 15. Σαυματομαρτυροῦς Ἀποστολικὸς καὶ Προφητικὸς Διδάσκαλος.  
\* *Hieron. Ep.* 29.  
*Apostolicorum temporum vir.*  
\* *Doctrinarum omnium accuratissimus explorator.* *Tertul.*  
*advers. Valer.*

In the next age after the *Apostles* flourished S. *Irenæus*, said to be martyred at *Lyons* (the seat of his *Bishoprick*) the 5<sup>th</sup> of *Severus*, *An. Chr.* 197. he had been an auditor of *Polycarpe Bishop of Smyrna* (styled by that Church an *Apostolical* and *Prophetic Doctor*) and is by \* S. *Hierome* looked on as a man of the *Apostolical* times, and by \* *Tertullian* as a most accurate searcher of all doctrines, and so is a most competent witness of the *Apostolical doctrine* and practice; and thus he speaks l. 2. *advers. har.* c. 38. *Omnes venit Christus per semet ipsum salvare, omnes inquam & hi per eum reſuscitantur in Deum, Infantes, & parvulos, & pueros*

pueros, & iuvenes, & seniores. Christ came to save all by himself, all I say who are born again unto God by him, Infants and little ones, and children, and young men and elder men, where it is evidently his affirmation, that infants (expressely) are by Christ regenerate unto God, and that must be in baptism, that laver of regeneration, and so they are not, in his opinion, excluded from baptism. And so this is a testimonie of the second Century, not found or pretended to be contradicted by any other of that age.

5. Immediately after Irenæus followed Tertullian in the end of the 2<sup>d</sup>, and beginning of the 3<sup>d</sup> Century, a man of great learning, and a diligent observer and recorder of the customs and practices of the most ancient Church. And he lib. de Animâ c. 39. affirms it from the Apostle, ex sanctificatione alterutro sexu sanctos præcreari, that when either parent is sanctified or believer, i. e. baptized, the children that are born from them are holy, and this tam ex seminis prerogativa, quam ex institutionis disciplina, both by prerogative of their seed, and by the discipline of the institution, i. e. (as hath been shewed) by baptism, adding from the same Apostle that delivered those words, 1 Cor. 7. 4. that his meaning was that the children of believers should be understood sub designati sanctitatis ac per hoc salutis, and evidencing what he means thereby, by the following words, of Christ's definition, Joh. 3. Unless a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of God, i. e. non eris sanctus, shall not be holy, where baptism is manifestly the thing by which these children are said to attain that sanctity; and more he addes in the beginning of the next chapter to the same purpose. And so he is a competent witness for the beginning of that third age, and is not found contradicted by any other passage in his works, or by any of his time; But on the contrary,

6. Origen, who died at Tyre, An. Chr. 254. hath three most irrefragable testimonies for it; first on Luke Hom. 14. Parvuli baptizantur in remissionem peccatorum, little ones are baptized into the remission of sins; and quomodo potest ulla levare in parvulis ratio subsistere, nisi iuxta illum sensum de quo paulo ante diximus, Nullus mundus a sorde &c. How can the account of baptizing little ones hold, but according to that which before was

said, none is clean from pollution, no not if he be but a day old, and per baptismi sacramentum natiuitatis sordes deponuntur, propterea baptizantur & parvuli, by the sacrament of baptisme the pollutions of our birth are put off, and therefore little ones are baptized.

7. Secondly, on *Leuiticus Hom. 8.* *Requiratur quid causa est cum baptisma Ecclesia in remissionem peccatorum detur, secundum Ecclesia observantiam etiam parvulis baptismum dari*— Let it be considered what the cause is when the baptisme of the Church is given for the remission of sins, that baptisme should according to the observation (or custome) of the Church be given to little ones.

8. Thirdly, on the *Epistle to the Romans, 1. 5.* *Ecclesia ab Apostolis traditionem suscepit etiam parvulis baptismum dare*— the Church hath received tradition from the Apostles to give baptisme to little ones also, such little ones still (as by the former words appears), as those of a day old and the like. And so here is a full concord of testimonies both for the practice of the Church, and tradition received from the Apostles for baptizing of infants, and so is a farther evidence of the doctrine of the third age, not contradicted by any of that time.

9. About the same time, or without question soon after, wrote the Author (under the name of *Dionysius Areopagita*) de *Eccl. Hierarch.* For, as by \* *Photius* it appears, *Theodorus Presbyter* about the year 410. debated the question, whether that writer were *Dionysius* mentioned in the *Acts* or no. And of this no doubt hath been made but that he was a very antient and learned Author. He therefore in his \* 7. chap. of *Eccl. Hierarch.* proposeth the question, as that which may seem to profane persons (i. e. heathens) ridiculous, why μάλα ἔγωγε τὰ θεῶν σωτηρίας διδάσκοντες τὴν ἑσῆς μέλλουσαν ζήσαντες διαγωγὰς children which cannot yet understand divine things are made partakers of the sacred birth from God, i. e. evidently of baptisme (μετὰ τὴν τὰ θεῶν βαπτισμὸν) concerning the baptizing of infants, saith *Maximus* his Scholiast) adding to the same head also, that οἱ τὴν αὐτῶν ἑλπίδα τὰς ἀπολαύσεις παρὰ τὴν ἑσῆς ἐκδοχῆς, others in their stead pronounce the abrenunciations and divine confessions. And his answer is, 1. that πολλά καὶ ὑπερβαῖον ἀγνοούμενων, ἀνίας ἔχει διαπραγμάνει many things which are unknown

\* Biblioth. lod. 1.

† Edit. Morel.

P. 233.

P. 119.

P. 234.

unknown by us why they are done, have yet causes worthy of God, 2. οἱ δὲ θεῖται τὰ τὰ παλαιὰ, ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἐκκλησιαστικὰ πρὸς τὰς αἰχλαίας μνηστῆρας παροδοῦσας εἰς ἡμᾶς ἀνέχοντες, that we affirm of this the same things which our divine officers of the Church, being instructed by divine tradition, have brought down unto us, and again, τὸ τοῖς θεοῖς ἡμῶν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν εἶδος ἐκδοῦν ἐκκλησιαστικὰ τὰ βιβλία κατὰ τὸν δὲν ἱερὸν βιβλίον — our divine guides (i. e. the Apostles, τὸς Ἀποστόλους ὡς πρὸς Maximus) considering this, appointed that infants should thus be admitted according to the sacred manner, nothing can be more clear then that the Apostolical tradition is by this ancient and elegant writer vouched for the baptizing of infants, as a sufficient account of that matter, against the reproaches and scoffes of profane, or heathen men, who deemed it unreasonable. And so there is a most convincing testimony for that time, wherein that author wrote, which must needs be in the fourth Century before Theodorus Presbyters debating the question concerning him, but most probably more ancient, and so to be placed in this third age.

10. In the midst of this third age, *An. Chr.* 248. was *S. Cyprian* made *Bishop of Carthage*, and ten years after he suffered *martyrdom*; i. e. 158 years after the age of the *Apostles*. In the year 257 he sat in *Councell* with 66 *Bishops* (see *Jusellus* in his *Preface* to the *African Canons* p. 21.) and their decrees by way of *Synodical Epistle* are to be seen in his *Ep.* 58. *ad Fidum fratrem*, which is now among his works. *Pamel. Edit.* p. 80. The *Councell* was in answer to some questions about *baptisme*, and accordingly he there sets down his own opinion, together with the decrees of that *Councell* of 66 *Bishops* which were assembled with him; And so this, as it is an *antient*, so it is more then a *single testimonie*, that of a whole *Councell* added to it; and yet farther, to increase the *authority* of it, *S. Augustine* cites this *Epistle* \* more then once, and sets it down almost *intire*, as a *testimony* of great weight against *heretikes*, and so tis cited by *S. Hierome* also, 1. 3. *dist. contr. Pelag.*
11. In this *Epistle* the question being proposed by *Fidus*, whether *infants* might be *baptized* the 2<sup>d</sup> or 3<sup>d</sup> day, or whether, as in *circumcision* the 8<sup>th</sup> day were not to be expected, he answers in the name of the *Councel*, *Universi judicavimus*, twas the reso-

11. In this *Epistle* the question being proposed by *Fidus*, whether infants might be baptized the 2<sup>d</sup> or 3<sup>d</sup> day, or whether, as in *circumcision* the 8<sup>th</sup> day were not to be expected, he answers in the name of the *Council*, *Universi judicavimus*, twas the reso-

denial or sentence of all, *nulli hominum nato misericordiam Dei & gratiam denegandam*, that the mercy and grace of God was not to be denied to any humane birth, to any child, though never so young, (by that phrase [mercy and grace of God] evidently meaning baptism, the rite of conveying them to the baptized) adding, that it is not to be thought that this grace which is given to the baptized; *pro eate accipientium vel minor vel major tribuitur*, is given to them in a greater or lesse degree in respect of the age of the receivers; and that God as he accepts not the person, so nor the age of any, confirming this by the words of S. Peter Act. 10. that none was to be called common or unclean, and that if any were to be kept from baptism, it should rather be those of full age, who have committed the greater sins; and that seeing those when they come to the faith are not prohibited baptism, *quanto magis prohiberi non debet infans, qui recens natus nihil peccaverit, nisi quod secundum Adam carnaliter natus contagium mortis antiquæ primâ nativitate contraxit? qui ad remissionem peccatorum accipiendam hoc ipso facilius accedit, quod illi remittuntur non propria sed aliena peccata*, how much more ought not the infant to be forbidden, who being new born, hath no sin upon him, but that which by his birth from Adam he hath contracted as soon as he was born, who therefore should more easily be admitted to pardon, because they are not his own, but others sins which are then remitted to him. Concluding that as none were by the decree of that Council to be refused baptism, *tum magis circa infantes ipsos & recens natos observandum acque retinendum*, so this was the rather to be observed and retained about infants and new born children.

12. Thus much and more was the sentence of that ancient Father and that Council, and as the occasion of that determination was not any antipadobaptist doctrine (there had no such then so much as lookt into the Church, that we can hear of;) but a conceit of one, that it should be deferr'd to the 8<sup>th</sup> day, which was as much infancy as the first (and so both parties were equally contrary to the Antipadobaptists interests, the condemned, as well as the Judges). so that it was no new doctrine that was then decreed, or peculiar to S. Cyprian (who had one singular opinion in the matter of baptism) appears also both by the concurrence of the whole Council that concurred with him, and by the expresse words of Saint



Saint Augustine Ep. 18. ad Hieronymum Beatus Cyprianus non aliquod decretum condens novum sed ecclesia fidem firmissemus servans — mox natum rite baptizari posse cum suis quibusdam coepiscopis censuit, Blessed Cyprian, saith he, not making any new decree, but keeping the faith of the Church most firme, decreed with a set number of his fellow Bishops, that a child new-born might sely be baptized. Which shewes it the resolution of that Father also, that baptizing of Infants was the faith of the Church before Cyprians time, not onely the opinion, but the Faith, which gives it the authority of Christ and his Apostles.

13. In the next or fourth Century, about the year of Christ 370. flourished Gregorie Nazianzen, and dyed in the year 389. who though he be by Mr. T. affirmed to dissuade from it but in case of necessity by reason of apparent danger of death, will yet give an evident testimonie of the doctrine of the Church of that age in this matter. P. 339.
14. In the \* 4<sup>th</sup> oration written on this subject of Baptisme having gone through all the ages of man (to demonstrate a proposition premised by him, \* πᾶσις ηλικίας ἀνθρώπου, πᾶσις ἰδέας βίης, that it belongs to every age and sort of life) he at length comes to the consideration of infancy, in these words, Νῦν δὲ δεῖ σοί, μὴ λαβέτω πᾶσις ἡ κακία, οὐ βέριος ἀναδίδωται, ἢ ὀνύχων καὶ δισσαδίσσω τῷ πνεύματι. If thou hast an infant, let not iniquity get time, let it be sanctified (certainly baptized) in infancy, let it in the tender age be consecrated to Gods spirit, and whereas the heathens use amulets and charmes to secure their children. \* δις αὐτῷ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ πατρί καὶ τῷ υἱοῦ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, do you give it the Trinity (the Fathers the Sonne and the Holy Ghost in baptisme) that great and good phylacterie, or preservative. A plain testimonie of the Churches doctrine at that time. \* Paris Edit. Tom. 1. p. 648. \* p. 647. D.
15. Afterwards in the \* same oration he returns to this matter again, Τί δὲ ἀν ἡμῶν οὐκ ἔτι νηπίων ὄντων, what, saith he, will you say concerning those that are yet children, and neither know the losse nor are sensible of the grace of baptisme, shall we also baptize them? And his answer is Πάντως, ἀπὸ τοῦ τοῦ πνεύματος καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, ἢ ἀποδιδόναι ἀποφεύγειν καὶ ἀτίλειαν, Yes by all means, if any danger presse, tis better they should be sanctified (baptized) when they have no sense of it, then that they should dy unsealed, uninitiated, adding for proof of this the ἐκκλησίαν &c. \* p. 643. C. \* p. 658. A.

περιτομή *circumcision* on the eighth day, which was, saith he, μυστικὴ πρὸς θεοῦ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἡ ἀρχὴ, *an initial seal*, and yet τῶν ἀλογιστῶν ἀποσπορεύειν, *used to those that had no use of reason*, and (in a lower degree) the anointing of the posts, which were insensible also, was yet a means of saving the first-born.

16. After this, tis true that he proceeds to consider those children, that are not in any danger of death, and of them he gives his opinion (δίδωμι γνώμην, in the style which S. Paul useth, when he speaks his own sense, as that is other from the revealed will of Christ) that staying about three years, at which time they may be taught to answer somewhat, though they understand it not perfectly, ὅπως ἀγαθὴν καὶ ψυχὰς καὶ σώματα τῷ μεγάλῳ μυστηρίῳ καὶ τελοῦσθαι, by this means they may be baptized, souls and bodies, by this great Sacrament of initiation.
17. But of this, 1. It is clear that it no way prejudices the doctrine and practice of the Church formerly set down, and approved by him, that infant children, indefinitely considered, might be baptized, and if danger approached, must, how young soever they were; which is as contrary to the Antipadobaptists, and so to Mr. T. as any thing.
18. 2<sup>dly</sup>. That it is but his γνώμη or private opinion pretending not so much as to any part of the Church of that, or former ages to authorize it.
19. 3<sup>dly</sup>. That the state of children being so weak and uncertain, that tis hard to affirm of any that they are not (for the first three years) in any danger, his counsel for deferring will hardly be ever practicable to any.
20. 4<sup>thly</sup>. That the deferring, of which Nazianzen speaks, is most probably to be understood of those whose parents are newly converted, and themselves doubt whether they shall be yet baptized or no, for to such he speaks in that place from p. 654. A.
21. Lastly, That the deferring till three years old, if it were allowed, would no way satisfy the Antipadobaptists pretensions, and so still the former passages ought be of force with all, and no heed given to the whispers of Mr. T. and others, as if this holy Father dissuaded baptism in any age unlesse in case of danger, when he clearly saith, καὶ οὐδὲν καὶ ἀποδοῦναι, let him in the tenderest age be baptized and consecrated to the Spirit.

22. In the same *Century S. Ambrose* must be placed, being a writer about the year 380. he in his 10<sup>th</sup> Book, *Ep. 84. ad Deme- triad. Virg.* speaking of those that made *Adams sin* no otherwise hurtfull to posterity, then by the example (*exemplo non transisse novisse*) he presseth it with this principal absurdity, *Hinc evacuationo baptismatis parvulorum*, this evacuates the baptisme of infants, which should then be capable of adoption onely, but not of pardon.
23. And in like manner on *Luke*, by *Jordans* being driven back, saith he, are signified the mysteries of baptisme, *per qua in primordia natura sua qui baptizati fuerint parvuli a malitia reformantur*, by which the little ones that are baptized, are reformed from their malignity to the first state of their nature.
24. In the beginning of the next or fifth age, flourished *S. Chrysostome*, that famous Bishop of *Constantinople* whose death is placed in the year of *Christ 407.* he in his homilie to the *Neophy:i* hath these words, *διὰ τούτο καὶ τὰ μυστήρια βαπτίζουσιν καὶ οἱ ἀμαρτανῶτα ἐκ ἔχοντα* for this cause (i. e. because there be so many benefits of baptisme, there recited, ten in number) we baptize children, though they have not sins.
25. Which words are the more worth remembring, because they had the hap to be made use of by the *Pelagians*, and consequently vindicated by *S. Augustine*, The *Pelagians* urged them in this forme, *Hac de causa etiam infantes baptizamus, cum non sint coinquinati peccato*, for this cause we baptize infants, when they are not polluted with sin, understanding it of original sin, but *S. Augustine* appealing to the *Greek*, shewed that the right rendring was, *quamvis peccata non habentes*, although they had not sins, i. e. propria, their own or actual sins, of which these infants were not supposed to have any.
26. So in his \* 4<sup>th</sup> Homilie on *Genesis*, speaking of baptisme as of the *Christian circumcision*, among other things he affirms of it, \* *Edit. Etom.* *ἡ δὲ ἀρεσκίμῳ ἔχει χρόνον, ἀλλὰ ἔστι καὶ ἐν ἀώρῳ ἡλικία, καὶ ἐν μέσῳ, καὶ ἔν τῳ γῆρας, γινόμενον πᾶσι πάντῳ δεῖσθαι τῷ χρόνῳ τῶν ἡμετέρων* \* *T. I. p. 322.* *ἡλικίᾳ*, it hath no determinate time but 'tis lawful both in the l. 11. So again, first age (the childhood, so ἀώρῳ ἡλικία signifies, with him, p. 327. l. 42. \* elsewhere applied to the time of circumcision on the 8<sup>th</sup> day, ἡλικία τῷ πρῶτῳ ἐν τῷ ἀώρῳ ἡλικία νεότητος — ) and in the middle, and ἐν ὑπομένει τὴν old πῆδας

- old age it self, to receive this circumcision made without hands.
27. In the same Centurie, very few years after, if not before C bry-  
 softome, S. Hierome must be placed, born in the year 342. and  
 deceased in the year 420. And he in Ep. 7. to Leta telling her  
 that whilst the child was yong and not come to Pythagoras's Y.  
 the bivism or two wayes, the knowledge of good and evil, tam  
 bona ejus quam mala parentibus imputantur, his good or evil  
 deeds are imputed to the parents, addes that this must needs be  
 acknowledged, nisi forte existimas Christianorum filios, si bap-  
 tisma non receperint, ipsos tantum reos esse peccati, & non etiam  
 scelum referri ad eos qui dare noluerint, maximè illo tempore quo  
 contradicere non poterant qui accepturi erant, sicut è regione salus  
 infantum majorum lucrum est. Unlesse, saith he, you believe that  
 Christians children, if they receive not baptisme, are the onely per-  
 sons that are guilty of the sin, and that the offence is not charged on  
 them which would not bring them to baptisme, at that time espe-  
 cially, wherein they that were to receive could not contradict, as on  
 the other side the salvation of infants is the gain of the elder, adding  
 that the parent which was thus to prepare his child for the Kings  
 i. e. Christs embraces, si negligens fuerit, punietur; shall, if he  
 be negligent therein, be punished.
28. Words of no very conformable aboad to the opposers of Pado-  
 baptisme, I wish Mr. T. who thinks fit to make use of S. Hieromes  
 name (it now appears how luckily) would be at leisure to consider  
 them.
29. So lib. 3. contr: Pelag. the question being asked by Crito, Qua-  
 re infantuli baptizentur, why infants are baptized, the answer, is  
 made by Atticus, Ut eis peccata in baptismate dimittantur,  
 that their sins may be pardoned in baptisme, and again, qui  
 parvulus est, parentis in baptismo vinculo solvitur, the infant is  
 30. freed in baptisme from the band of Adams sin.
- Paulinus, we know, was his Contemporarie, and from him we  
 have this testimonie, Ep. 12. Inde parens sacro ducens de fonte  
 sacerdos, Infantes niveos corpore, corde, habitu— The Priest brings  
 the infants out of the font white as snow in body, in heart, in habit.
31. Next to these succeeds S. Augustine, who died in the 30<sup>th</sup> year  
 of this 5<sup>th</sup> age, and was the great champion of the Church against  
 all the invaders of the depositum committed to it. His passages on  
 this

this subject are to many to be enumerated, and some of them have already been set down in the *Resol.* of the *Quere* p. 217. making it the *perpetual doctrine* of the whole Church of all ages before him, and expressly including that of the *Apostles*.

32. So de Bap: contra Danat. l. 4. c. 23. *Quod traditum tenet universitas Ecclesie cum parvuli infantes baptizantur, qui coram nondum possunt corde credere ad justitiam, & ore confiteri ad salutem — & tamen nullus Christianorum dixerit eos inaniter baptizari.* This is held as tradition by the Universal Church, when little infants are baptized, which are sure yet unable to believe with the heart or to confesse with the mouth, and yet no Christian will say that they are baptized to no purpose: (a severe sentence again for the Antipedobaptist) adding the Ecclesiastical rule by which to judge of Apostolical tradition, and evidencing the benefit of infant baptisme by the example of circumcision, that as in Isaac, circumcised the eighth day, the seal of the righteousness of faith preceded, and the righteousness it self followed in his riper age by his imitating his Fathers faith, ita & in baptizatis infantibus precedit regenerationis Sacramentum, & si Christianam tenuerint pietatem, sequitur in corde conversio, cujus mysterium precessit in corpore, so also in baptized infants the Sacrament of regeneration precedes, and if they hold fast Christian piety, conversion in the heart follows, the mystery whereof had been formerly received in the body.

33. So De verb: Apost. Sermon. 14. being come to handle this subject of the baptisme of infants, he begins thus, *Solicitos autem nos facit non ipsa sententia jam olim in Ecclesia Catholica summa auctoritate fundata, sed dispositiones quorundam* — The doctrine it self gives us no trouble, being long since founded in the Catholike Church by the highest authority (that sure must be by Christ and the Apostles) but the disputings of some men — and again, *Non enim questio est inter nos & ipsos, utrum parvuli baptizandi sint, Baptizandos esse parvulos nemo dubitat, quando nec illi hinc dubitant qui ex altera parte contradicunt* — the question betwixt them and us is not, whether infants are to be baptized; Let no man make doubt of this, seeing neither do they doubt of this which contradict us in the other question concerning the benefit of it.

34. And again, in a farther process with those *disputers*, Dic mihi, obsecro te, parvulis baptizatis Christus aliquid prodest, an nil prodest? Necessè est, ut dicat prodesse, Premitur mole matris Ecclesie. Doth Christ profit infants that are baptized, or doth he not? He must needs say that he doth profit, he is prest with the weight of the Church our mother.
35. And again, auctoritate reprimuntur Ecclesia, si enim dixerint Christum nihil prodesse baptizatis infantibus, nihil aliud dicunt quàm superflue baptizantur infantes. They are repress by the authority of the Church, for if they say that Christ profits not infants baptized, they plainly affirme that infants are superfluously baptized, but this those very heretikes (the Pelagians) dicere non audent, dare not say, and so were faine to secure their hypothesis by another evasion, viz. that they were baptiz'd not for salvation but for the kingdome of heaven.
36. And yet farther, Hoc habet auctoritas matris ecclesie, hoc fundatus veritatis obtinet canon, contra hoc robur, contra hunc inexpugnabilem murum quisquis arietat ipse confringitur. Fundata ista res est, ferendus est peccator errans in aliis questionibus — non tantum progredi debet, ut & fundamentum ipsum ecclesia quaterere moliat. This the authority of our mother the Church is posselt of, this the grounded Canon of truth holds fast; against this fort, this invinsible wall whosoever makes assault, is broken to pieces. This is a grounded thing: Hee is to be born with who erres in other questions, but he must not proceed thus far (as the Antipedobaptist certainly doth) as to endeavour to shake the very foundation of the Church, i. e. certainly a doctrine laid by the first planters of the faith, Christ and the Apostles themselves.
37. So Ep. 89. Non est superfluous baptismus parvulorum, ut qui per generationem illi condemnationi obligati sunt, per regenerationem ab eadem liberentur. The baptisme of infants is not superfluous, that they who by their birth are bound to that condemnation which came by Adam, should be freed from it by regeneration, and more to the same purpose in that place.
38. So in Enchirid. c. 42. à parvulo recens nato usque ad decrepitum senem, sicut nullus prohibendus est à baptismo, ita nullus est qui non peccato moriatur in baptismo. From the infant new born

born to the decrepit old age, as none is to be kept from baptisme, so there is none who dyeth not to sin in baptisme.

39. Which words are soon after transcribed by *Leo* (ad *Episc. Aquileg.*) who was advanced to the *Papacie* about the year 440.
40. About this time was the *Epistle* of the *Council* of *Carthage* written to *Innocentius* (made *Bishop* of *Rome* about the year 400.) In which these words we find by way of Decree, *Quicumque negat parvulos per baptismum Christi à perditione liberari & salutem percipere sempiternam, anathema sit, whosoever denies that Infants are by the baptisme of Christ freed from perdition and receive eternal life, let him be anathema.*
41. About the same time, whilest *Innocentius* lived (and to the same purpose) was the *Milevian Canon*, at which *S. Augustine* was present, a *Bishop* in that *Council*. This hath been set down in the *Resol.* of the *Quare*, p. 219. and is an evident testimonie that this doctrine was such as *Ecclesia Catholica ubique diffusa semper intellexit*, the *Catholike Church* every where diffused, alwaies understood and asserted, and so it is that *Councils* witnesses of the *Apostolicallness* of it.
42. To these it were easy to adde *Theodoret* also, and *Leo* (already cited) soon after him, both falling within the former part of that *fift Centurie*, and in every age after this, store enough. But the question is not, and in any reason cannot be extended to those times, the clear definitions through all those *first ages*, being all that could be required to decide the *controversie* concerning the matter of fact, whether it were practised or not practised by the *Apostles*.
43. And having so largely deduced them, it is not imaginable what should be now wanting to the completing of the evidence, when I have onely added, that there is no one testimonie of dissent, either pretended or producible from the writings of all those *first ages*, nor consequently the least appearance of obstacle, why the receiving of *Infants* to baptisme should not be resolved the doctrine and practice of the *first* and *purest* ages of the *Church*, avouched and testified to be delivered to them by the *Apostles* of *Christ*, who could not mistake his meaning in the *Institution*.
44. What artifices the *Antepadobaptist* can make use of to cast a



*mist* before our eyes, in the midst of so much *light*, I can no way *divine* : sure I am that the *prejudices* which Mr. T. bath in few words indeavour'd to *infuse* (as that *some are counterfeit authors, some suspected, some misinterpreted*; that *some maintained infant baptism but in case of danger of death, that others which avouched this, avouched either Rebaptization or Communion of Infants also*) are all of them *unjust and causeless*, and have severally and *punctually* been *prevented* in one or both of these *discourses*, and so there remains not the least scruple of *difficulty*, that I can foresee in this *matter*, to add to the bulke of this vindication.

45. God assist it with his *blessing* to the *disabusing* those that are *seduced*, and regaining them to the *ways of Peace*.

*The End.*

E R R A T A.

Page.	Line.	Read.
13	8	then it
17	21	<i>Alpes</i>
20	32	the whiteness
28	ult.	כי ציברת שנת גיורת צריך
32	17	continuing
	21	αἰτῶ
40	25	of receiving
42	35	in to
44	11	heed to
48	21	of pers:
61	13	So <i>Cyrill</i> in-
	18	they that
64	20	infants
67	15	<i>crediderit</i>
79	36	after infants adde being
80	5	ministry
83	3	then this
84	24	now to
91	2	but if
102	34	to be

The

---

# The CONTENTS of the several Chapters and Sections contained in this BOOK.

---

## CHAP. I.

OF Baptisme among the Jewes. page 2

### Sect. 1.

*Probations more and less perfect. The use of Circumcision to this question of Padobaptisme. As also of Christ's reception of children. Childrens coming and believing, Mat: 18. Children sinners.* 2

### Sect. 2.

*The necessity of Padobaptisme depending on the positive Part of probation. The several sorts of Anabaptists. Testimonies the onely proof of Institutions.* 6

### Sect. 3.

*The Jewes Baptisme of natives as well as Profelytes. Testimonies of their writers in proof thereof. Baptisme among the heathens taken from the Jewes. Among both from Noahs flood. The derivation of Christian from Jewish Baptisme how manifested. Christs answer to Nicodemus. Baptisme ascribed to the deluge. Gr. Nazianzen's and Macarius's testimonies. The Fathers meaning in affirming the Christians baptisme to be in stead of Circumcision.*

---

## The Contents.

---

*Circumcision. The Lords Supper founded in the Jewes Pascuum, yet in stead of their Passeeover.* 8

### Sect. 4.

*The conceipts of Pe: Alfunsus and Schickard of the Jewish baptisme. Raf: Alphen: Mr. T. his conclusion not inferred. The original of the Jewish Baptisme ( the onely doubt ) vindicated. Jacob's injunction to his family. Sanctifications Exod. 19. 10. differ from washing garments.* 17

### Sect. 5.

*Mr. Selden's notion of the Sea. The defence of my notion of it. Learned mens affirmations to be judged of by their testimonies. Christ's baptizing of Jewes as well as Gentiles, no argument. Christ's vouching Iohns baptisme to be from heaven, no argument. No more, the pretended no intimations of it. The no conformity. The proselytes children baptized, continually, not onely at the first conversion. The baptisme of a woman with child, serving for the child also, not argumentative. The Canon of Neocæsarea about it.* 23

### Sect. 6.

*Lesser inconformities no prejudice. Yet they do not all hold, Prayer the Christian sacrifice. פָּרַחַח The rule of judging in this matter. Baptizing in the name of the Father &c. prescribed by Christ. So dipping or sprinkling. The Pract. Cat. misreported. Mr. Marshals covenanting.* 30

CHAP. II.

*Of Christ's words. Mat. 28. 19. pag. 34*

*Sect. 1.*

*The Doctors pretended concessions examined. Christ's institution of baptism not set down Mat. 28. but necessarily before that time.* 34

*Sect. 2.*

*Making disciples all one with receiving into discipleship. Baptizing the act of the Baptist. Instruction subsequent to discipling. The pretended parallel between Mat. 28. and Mar. 16. Ευαγγελισται. Johns discipling by preaching excludes not infants. No more the Apostles, Mat. 10. 5. The notation of the word μαθηται. Mat. 13. 52. Act. 14. 21. Infants both said to come and so believe. Instruction subsequent to baptism.* 40

*Sect. 3.*

*Discipleship before instruction. What knowledge of the Master is required to discipleship. Two sorts of disciples, Some come, others are brought.* 50

*Sect. 4.*

*The difference of a Disciple and Profelyte examined. Christian as well as Jewish profelytes. Priviledges of profelytisme. Disciples of the Pharisees. The Holy Ghost's not using the word Profelyte of Christians, concludes nothing. Jehovah. Ουνοῦ. Infants qualified for baptism. As for entering into Covenant Deut:*

## The Contents.

Deut. 29. Gods oath. Infants adjured. Criples capable of  
Christ's cures. 53

### CHAP. III.

Of the Apostolical practice in this matter. pag. 58

#### SECT. 1.

The interpretation of 1 Cor. 7. 12. vindicated. \*Αγία. Sancti-  
fication used to denote baptism, the use of it in the Fathers and  
Scripture. Tertullians testimonie: designati Sanctitatis. Ori-  
gen. Author Quast: ad Antiochum. Cyprian. Chrysostome.  
Τόξα there, infant children. \*Αγρι in the Epistles. S. Augu-  
stines words examined. 58

#### SECT. 2.

The rendring ἁγιάσαι [hath been sanctified] defended. S. Hiero-  
nimes testimonie. Enallages must not be made use of without  
necessity. No advantage from it here. Feigned instances of  
Enallage. Κλώμενον, ἀγιάζαται ἔτι, δ' ἐδέλωται. Κίριτις. 66

#### SECT. 3.

The rendring ἐν γυναικὶ by the woman] defended, ἐν for ἐς. Κη-  
ρυχθῆναι ἐν πάσῃ κλίσει Col. 1. 23. Κηρύττει. Δεδωμένον ἐν ἀνθρώ-  
ποις Αἴ. 4. Ireneim no Latine author. ἐν πατρίσιν Αἴ. 7. Gal.  
1. 16. 1 Pet. 1. 5. ἐν τοῖς Deut. 28. \*Ελαβες δόματα ἐν ἀνθρώποις,  
Psal. 68. My proof of the interpretation from the context. 69

#### SECT. 4.

Mr. T. his mistake of my sense. The argument à genere ad  
speciem. \*Αγιάζαται and \*Αγία. How the husband is said to be bap-  
tized

## The Contents.

sized by the wife. *ΠΥΓΓ* partial washings. The proportion between legal holyness, and baptisme. Difference between relative and real sanctification. The testimonies of the antients, for and against my interpretation. 77

### CHAP. IV.

An answer to Mr. Tombes's view of my Conclusion and therein the sense of Antiquity in this Question. pag. 84

#### SECT. 1.

*Τίνα, 1 Cor. 7. infant children. The Jewes practice. Their notion of [ holy ] Baptisme a priviledge of believers children, yet is communicated to others whose guardians are believers. The severall sorts of holyness all vainly mentioned by Mr. T. His denials of the Conclusion. The place in Tertullian vindicated. S. Hieromes answer to Paulinus. Institutionally disciplina in Tertullian. Candidati Damoniorum. A 3<sup>d</sup> denial of the Conclusion. The use of baptisme to regenerate &c. No prejudice to the founding it in the Jewish practice. His art of diversion to put off answering of testimonies. The way of Testimonies insisted on.* 84

#### SECT. 2.

A Catalogue of Testimonies of the first ages for Infant baptisme, and the Apostolicallness thereof. 96

Books written by *H. Hammond D. D.*

**A** Paraphrase and Annotations upon all the Books of the New Testament.  
In fol.

2. *The Practical Catechisme*, with all other English Treatises in two volumes  
in 4<sup>to</sup>.

3. *Of Fundamentals* in a notion referring to Practice. in 12<sup>o</sup>.

Several Books of Controversies relating to the present  
times, by the same Author in two large volumes in 4<sup>to</sup>.  
viz.

1. *Dissertationes quatuor, quibus Episcopatus Iura ex S. Scripturis & Primæva  
Antiquitate adstruuntur, contra sententiam D. Blondelli & aliorum. Autore  
Henrico Hammond, in 4<sup>o</sup>.*

2. *A Vindication of the Dissertations concerning Episcopacy from the Excep-  
tions offered against them by the London Ministers in their Jus Divinum  
Ministerii Evangelici in 4<sup>o</sup>.*

3. *An Answer to the Animadversions on the Dissertations touching Ignatius  
Epistles and the Episcopacy in them asserted, subscribed by John Owen  
servant of Jesus Christ, in 4<sup>o</sup>.*

4. *Of Schisme. A Defence of the Church of England, against the Excepti-  
ons of the Romanists, in 12<sup>o</sup>.*

5. *A Reply to the Cathol. Gent: Answer to the most materiell part of the  
Book of Schisme, together with an Account of H. T. His Appendix to  
his Manuall of Controversies &c 4<sup>o</sup>.*

6. *A Letter of Resolution of six Quæries, in 12<sup>o</sup>.*

7. *An account of Mr. <sup>Cawdrey</sup> Triplex Diatrib. concerning Superstition,  
Will-worship, and Christians Festivals. New.*

THE END.

U. 179.



